Bunner-Rich Debate

A Public Discussion

between

Mr. A. A. Bunner

and

Elder Ben E. Rich

held at

Fairmont, W. Va.

March 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th, 1912

The Bunner-Rich Debate

A Public Discussion

between

Mr. A. A. Bunner

of the Church of Christ

and

Elder Ben E. Rich

of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

Held March 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th, 1912. Subject for discussion, "Resolved: That John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last Prophets sent by God, and that the Bible as given to us by Christ and the Apostles in Palestine, is sufficient to guide men and women to salvation from sin."—Mr. Bunner affirmed and Elder Rich denied.

Copyrighted 1912, by Ben E. Rich, New York City, N. Y.

For sale at the following places:

Southern States Mission, Box 417, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Eastern States Mission, 33 W. 126th Street, New York City.
Northern States Mission, 110 S. Paulina Street, Chicago, Ill.
Central States Mission, 302 S. Pleasant Street, Independence, Mo.
Western States Mission, 622 W. Sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo.
Northwestern States Mission, Box 295, Portland, Ore.
California Mission, Box 127, Los Angeles, Cal.
Bureau of Information, Temple Block, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Deseret News Book Store, Salt Lake City, Utah.

PRESS OF
HENRY C. ETTEN & CO.,
CHICAGO.

PREFACE

THIS debate has been prepared from stenographic notes taken by four stenographers who worked independently in the transcribing of their notes. The reports were then carefully compared and only such matter is included as was agreed upon by all of them. We do not claim, therefore, that this is a verbatim report or that it is complete. We do claim, however, that what is found herein is correct. The arguments here reported have been carefully compared with personal notes taken and every effort has been used to deal fairly with the speeches as will be seen from the correspondence published herewith.

Upon the last night of the debate the tables which had been used by our stenographers were removed from the room without our knowledge and it was necessary to clear our end of the speaker's stand for the use of two of them, the other two being compelled to take their notes under great difficulty. It is only fair to say that the stenographers had less trouble in taking President Rich's speeches than those of Mr. Bunner. First, because President Rich spoke more slowly and with better articulation; second, because they were accustomed to taking dictation from him. An effort was made to get the court stenographer in Fairmont to take the debate, in order that the report might be complete and that a charge of unfairness should not be made. This gentleman could not be induced to do so because he was overcrowded with work.

An opportunity was given Mr. Bunner to read his speeches and to make such suggestions concerning them as he saw fit. It seems this should relieve us from any charge of unfairness and his refusal to make any suggestions whatever with reference to them indicates his unwillingness to have the debate go out where it may be more widely read. The speech which we sent him for suggestions for correction

was returned to us from the office of Mr. Neil of the American Anti-Mormon Association, with headquarters in Kentucky, and the few corrections that were made in it we readily adopted.

Our purpose in publishing the debate is that those who are earnest in the investigation of the gospel of Jesus Christ may see what we teach with reference to its fundamental principles and that they may see how we differ from other Christian Denominations. We are sending it out with the hope that it may be widely read by all who are interested in religious teaching and that it may do something towards stimulating investigation of theological questions.

EASTERN STATES MISSION.

SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION

Resolved: "That John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last Prophets sent by God, and that the Bible as given to us by Christ and the Apostles in Palestine is sufficient to guide men and women to salvation from sin."

AFFIRMATIVE, MR. BUNNER

NEGATIVE, ELDER RICH

FIRST NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

REV. A. A. BUNNER.

Moderators, My Fellow Debater, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am certainly glad to have this privilege to appear before you tonight on the affirmative of the following proposition:

"RESOLVED, that John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets sent by God, and that the Bible, as given to us by Christ and the apostles in Palestine, is a sufficient guide to man and woman for salvation from sin." I do not have the proposition before me, but this is the wording as I now remember it, and while I am sorry to see you so uncomfortably situated, I am glad to appear before as many people as we have here tonight.

I am aware of one thing, that is that there are people who are opposed to these discussions; many excellent people are opposed to them, because they think they do not do any good. For my part, I think a religious discussion, when conducted in a proper spirit, is calculated to do more good, than simply preaching to the people. If I stand before

you in defense of the truth, I, of course, in a discussion of this kind, get more people to hear me than I would on ordinary occasions. If I have the truth, it enables me to get the truth before more people in an investigation of this kind than on ordinary occasions, and so I appear before you tonight in the defense of the proposition which I have just stated. While I shall attempt to investigate this proposition tonight, I ask your undivided attention to what I shall say. I am glad for another reason that I am to take part in this investigation as I am glad to meet this distinguished gentleman President Ben E. Rich, one of whom it is said, he stands in the front rank of his people as a public speaker and debater. In appearing before you tonight, I do not claim any superior knowledge; I do not come here claiming any superior learning or any superior gift; I do not claim to possess any miraculous power, but I come here claiming that the strength of the proposition which I am to defend, and the weakness of the position which I think my friend occupies in this investigation are sufficient to justify my taking part in this discussion. It is expected that in the investigation of the proposition that we are to define in clear and distinct terms all terms used in the proposition, and because our proposition is a lengthy one, I prefer to define the terms in it as I use them; as I come to them in the course of this investigation. The proposition before us divides itself into two members, the first is that Jesus Christ and John the Baptist were the last prophets sent of God, and the second is that the Bible, as given to us by Christ and the Apostles in the land of Palestine, is a sufficient guide to salvation from sin. Now the standard to which we appeal for proof of this proposition, as I understand it, is the King James version of the Holy Scriptures. My friend prefers this version, and I do not object to using it.

Now why am I here, why do I affirm a proposition of this kind, that John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets sent by God? I am here simply because this statement is called in question not only by my friend Mr. Rich, but by many others. We have, for instance, the Seventh Day Adventists and the Mohammedans who do not believe this proposition. They believe that other prophets have been sent by God since Jesus Christ. I think my friend here be-

lieves that other prophets have been sent by the God of Heaven since he sent the Lord Jesus Christ into the world. As far as John the Baptist is concerned, we agree that he preceded Christ, that he was a prophet, that he went before him to prepare the way for the Lord and to teach the people to believe on the one that was to come after, that is, on Christ. But the main point at issue is that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent of God, the last one that the God of Heaven has sent into this world to make known to the world the way of life and salvation. We read in the first chapter of the Hebrew Letter, first and second verses,

> "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

Now I want to emphasize this statement that he has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son. Now these last days spoken of are the days which began with the day of Pentecost, and they will terminate with the reign of Jesus Christ as King of Kings and as Lord of Lords in the Kingdom. These are the last days as spoken of by the writer of the Hebrew Letter, and he declares that in these last days God spoke unto us by his Son. As evidence that he so spoke to these people, God also bore them witness with signs, with miracles and with covenants to the Holy Spirit which he bestowed upon those through whom he confirmed words that he spoke unto us by his Son. Now I want to call your attention to the scene that transpired on the Mount of Transfiguration. When Jesus took his three disciples, Peter, James and John, to be transformed before them, his raiment became white as snow. Upon this occasion Moses and Elias appeared unto Jesus and his disciples, and the disciples were much afraid. They thought Moses and Elias were on an equality with Jesus, and they said unto the Lord,

> "It is good for us to be here, let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses and one for Elias."

We see then that these disciples placed Moses and Elias upon an equality with Christ, but notice what the God of Heaven did when he appeared unto them after they had made this declaration. There came an oracle from the lips

of God saying, "This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him." The thought here is this, (and I will prove it by another Scripture, presently), when God said, "This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," he proposed to disabuse the minds of the three disciples, that is of Peter, James and John of the idea of putting Moses and Elias on an equality with Christ, don't you see? This was what he was doing, this is what he was going to disabuse their minds of; this was as much as to say to them, you are not to hear Moses and Elias any longer, but ye are to hear my Son, hear ye him. Elias, as a representative of the prophets of the Old Testament, came and laid his commission down at the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ, and surrendered his commission as prophet to the Lord Jesus Christ. Why? Because the last prophet that God had sent appeared in the person of Jesus Christ, and of course those who preceded him were to lay down their commission at his feet. Then Moses, as a prophet and law giver, and as a mediator of the old covenant, laid down his commission at the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ, don't you see, that the God of Heaven said, "You shall hear Moses and the prophets no longer, but hear my Son, hear ye him." Do you see now the meaning of the first and second verses of the Hebrew Letter that I quoted before? Shall we expect then to hear the prophet speak to us of this generation and of this age? No, sir. He spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, not to you and to me, but to the fathers by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, and if you can get in another prophet in these last days since the Son, then the declarations of the writer of the Hebrew Letter are not true when he said he spoke to us by his Son. Now we want to get as near as we can to a correct definition of the term prophet. What are we to understand the work of a prophet to be? I will read from high authority the definition of the term. We read from Dr. William Smith's Bible Dictionary:

> "That the word prophet is derived from a word which means to bubble forth like a fountain, and would signify either a person who, as it were, voluntarily bursts forth with spiritual utterances under the divine influence, or a man to whom announcements are made by God, that is one who is inspired."

You notice from this definition that a prophet simply stands between God and man, an inspired man inspired by the Holy Spirit, and through that individual God communicates his will to the people.

Is this not in keeping with the declaration that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets." Now we are to bear in mind that it was God speaking to the people by his Holy Spirit, that he spoke through the prophets, or revealed or made known to them his will. This then was the work of the prophet, but he might also foretell future events. The foretelling of future events was an evidence of a true prophet provided these prophecies were fulfilled to the letter, and if such prophecies were not fulfilled it was an evidence of a false prophet. Prophecy fulfilled, then, is the evidence of a true prophet. Now, what I want Mr. Rich to do in replying to this is to show, if he can, that any other prophets were sent by God who spoke to the people or who foretold the coming of future events. I want him to show that some other prophets have been sent of God, authorized by God, and that they stand on an equal footing with the Lord Jesus Christ, and if his words are not heard, which are the words of the God of Heaven, we have the statement made in Holy Scripture that the people that heareth not such a prophet shall be destroyed from among the people. This then is what Mr. Rich will have to do. He will have to show us that some other prophet has been sent whose words have been heard by the people. Now did God say this concerning any other prophet except Jesus Christ that if his words were not heard he should be destroyed from among the people? This is what I want him to bring out. We read in the Scriptures that "Every soul that heareth not this prophet shall be destroyed from among the people." This was the declaration he made concerning Christ, and I want Mr. Rich to show that it has been made concerning some other prophet.

We have in another statement of the Scriptures the assurance that God was to send into the world one like unto Moses. We understand from this that Moses was a type of the Lord Jesus Christ. Elijah was not like Moses though he was a prophet, but Moses was a prophet and a law

giver. Elijah simply called the people back to the laws of Moses, simply called their attention to the law that had been given by him. Elijah was not a law giver, but Moses was a prophet and a law giver to the people, and through him God gave a law to govern the nation of Israel for more than fifteen hundred years. He was not only a law giver but a mediator of the old covenant that we read of in Jeremiah 31 chapter and 31 verse.

> "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah."

Now this prophecy is referred to in the 8th chapter of the Hebrew Letter quoting the very language used by Jeremiah, and showing that Jesus Christ fulfilled this prophecy uttered by Jeremiah. Now have we a newer covenant than this? I want Mr. Rich, if he can, to show that God has made a newer covenant than this one spoken of by Jeremiah, Here is work for my friend to do, don't you see? Now he can do just as he pleases about showing that there has been a newer covenant, but I want to tell you that my opponent will have something to do before this investigation is over to show that there has been a newer covenant than this one that was spoken of by Jeremiah and fulfilled in the coming of Christ.

Another question that must enter this discussion before it is ended is a question of Priesthood, and I am to show you that Christ was not a High Priest while he remained upon the earth, and that he had to go into Heaven and there become a High Priest upon his throne. The coming of Jesus Christ into the world set aside the Priesthood of Aaron because in this passage of Scripture which we have quoted in Jeremiah it was foretold that the day would come when the Lord would make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah, and when that new covenant was established the old one, or the Priesthood of Aaron, was set aside. Now Paul in the Hebrew Letter declares that God did make that new covenant, and that Christ became the mediator in this new covenant. Now if Christ became the mediator and the prophet, priest and king of the new covenant, that sets aside the Priesthood of Aaron, don't you see? If any prophet had superseded Christ

who has established a newer covenant, a different one than this of which we have been speaking, then this will not be the new covenant because the last named is the new covenant, and if the institution known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is a newer covenant, as it claims to be, why then Paul did not know what he was talking about when he spoke of the new covenant. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints must be the new covenant, and it was not in existence at the time of Paul's writing, and he must have been mistaken in assuming that the covenant fulfilled in Jesus Christ was the one spoken of by Jeremiah, don't you see? The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints would be the new covenant, and whatever rule of faith and practice it takes to govern that institution would be the new testament of the God of Heaven, and hence it is not true that he has spoken to us in the last days by his Son.

I want now to say another word on the question of the High Priest, and I refer you to the 9th chapter of the Hebrew Letter. I will lay down this proposition here that a High Priest could not officiate outside the most holy place, and that, therefore, Christ could not officiate as a High Priest while he was upon the earth. In order to officiate in the most holy place, the Priest had to carry with him blood, and the Priests who were officiating in the most holy place would not allow Jesus Christ to officiate there while he was upon the earth. I want to impress these things upon your mind because Jesus Christ could not do these things while he was upon the earth. He could not go into the holy place or the Temple because the High Priests who officiated there would have withstood him, he would have been a violator of the law of God. Now this holy place was a type of Heaven, and the Priests who officiated therein were, as you know, of the Tribe of Aaron, but Christ came from the Tribe of Judah and could not be a priest on earth. After he arose from the dead, in order to properly establish his church, he ascended into Heaven and there became a Priest on his Throne. Now as the Priest who entered the most holy place on earth entered with blood, so also Christ entered Heaven, the type of the most holy place, with his own precious blood, and took his seat at the right

hand of the Majesty on High, and there he officiates as the Great High Priest. Now has anybody got this Priesthood from Christ? Joseph Smith claimed he got it. He also claimed that he got the priesthood of Aaron which I have shown you was set aside by Christ. That is what these people are out here teaching. He claims, therefore, both the Priesthood of Aaron and the High Priesthood of Christ, which He did not hold until after He entered Heaven with his own precious blood. Joseph Smith is well fixed for Priesthood, but I have shown you that if Christ were upon earth He would not be a Priest on earth. Yet Joseph Smith claimed to be Priest on earth. Jesus Christ would not have officiated in the Priesthood after the order of Aaron, but according to this Hebrew Letter he has obtained a more excellent ministry by means of a better covenant. Now if the first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no need for a second. When the second came, it came through the Son of God, and, therefore, the second covenant should have been faultless. Now Joseph Smith was not the Son of God, and yet if he has instituted a newer covenant than the covenant instituted by the Son of God, then Christ could not introduce a faultless covenant but it was left for Joseph Smith, Jr., to introduce a faultless covenant and an unchangeable Priesthood. In the days of Christ and before his days Aaronic Priesthood was only a figure for the time present, but my opponent will claim that the Aaronic Priesthood is still upon the earth, in power. Christ ascended on High and entered into the most holy place as the Great High Priest to purchase Redemption for us, and as I have shown you that no testament, though it may claim to come from God, is of any force unless it has been dedicated with blood, that Christ entered Heaven with his own precious blood, and I challenge my friend to show during this discussion that the Book of Mormon or the Pearl of Great Price, or the Revelations of Joseph Smith were so dedicated. Even the old testament had to be so dedicated, and if the old testament were dedicated with blood and the new testament were dedicated with blood, then there was no necessity for the dedicating of any other testament, and the Scripture was full, don't you see? My friend may say that Joseph Smith sealed his testimony

with his blood, but he will have to put the blood of Joseph Smith on an equality with the blood of Jesus Christ. This is what we want you to think about. These are the things that are up for investigation, and we propose to investigate these things. Well now we have shown that Christ was the last prophet sent of God, but I want to invite your attention to another Scripture that I promised you earlier in the evening I would read. We read in Matthew, chapter 21, verses 33 to 38, this beautiful parable:

> "There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruit of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his Son, saying, They will reverence my Son. But when the husbandmen saw the Son, they said among themselves, this is the heir; come, let us kill him and let us seize on his inheritance."

We see from this reading that it was "last of all" that he sent his Son saying, "They will reverence him." When was it now that he sent his Son? Why, "last of all." Now if you get in a prophet since the Son of God, then the statement is not true that Jesus Christ was sent "last of all." Then Matthew did not state the truth when he said that his Son was sent "last of all." What is my proposition? Why, that John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets sent by God. Referring to our parable, we see that Moses and the earlier prophets were sent to the vineyard, that they were stoned and many of them killed, and that the other prophets who were sent received like treatment, and that "last of all" he sent his Son. Now you cannot get anything in after "last of all." You cannot get another prophet from God after he sent his Son, for Matthew declares that he sent him "last of all." What did they say, "This is the heir, we will kill him and seize upon his inheritance." They slew his Son, slew the last one sent of God, and now he says he will send his armies to destroy

these wicked murderers. Now I want you to pay attention to these Scriptures because this is to be the standard, and I want my friend to answer this argument, if he can. Jesus declared repeatedly, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," and yet my friend will tell you that he is not the last, and if he can get in another prophet after this, then the Son of God was not the last, and this is what we want him to do. Now I should be perfectly willing to leave this proposition here because my argument cannot be assailed. Jesus was to be a prophet like unto Moses, not like others such as Elias and Elijah, but like Moses. What was Moses? He was a law giver to the nation of Israel, to the true Israel of God, don't you see, and Jesus Christ was a law giver, as Paul tells us in his Galatian letter, 3rd chapter and 13th verse:

> "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree: That the blessings of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

Christ then is the head of the spiritual offspring of Abraham, and if you get Joseph Smith in after that you displace Christ and put Joseph Smith in his place, don't you see? Now my friend will want to know what I am going to do with the prophets of the new testament. He may want to know what I am going to do with them. Well, now we must learn to distinguish between those whom Christ sent and those whom God sent. We must make that distinction first. I say we must learn to distinguish between those whom God sent and those whom Christ sent. Now take for instance Moses. Moses was sent by God, but before Jesus Christ ascended on High he said to his disciples, "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you," and "He gave some apostles and some prophets and some Evangelists and some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ that we henceforth be not mere children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the slight of

men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." But Mr. Smith had his church in existence a long time before his apostles were set in it. You see he did not make his church like Jesus Christ did. He got his cart before the horse, but Jesus set his apostles in the church first; as we have seen from the Scripture just quoted that he sent them as God had sent him. We will now make this distinction between the work of Christ, and the prophets who were sent before him. When God on the Mount of Transfiguration said, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him." as far as I know, he left no written record of his will before this time. It is true he had spoken through his prophets, but he did not give unto them the power to speak for themselves, he gave unto Christ the power to speak for himself. Now what does Christ say, having been given this authority, to his apostles before he sent them out? "Those that hear you, hear me." Paul says, "We are imitators of the Lord," so Paul and all the rest of the apostles were sent by the Lord Jesus Christ, and they stood in his shoes as he stood in the shoes of his Father, and they did just what he would have done in person had he been there.

I now take up their articles of faith of Mr. Rich's Church, in which I find tremendous doctrine. The first article of their faith reads, "We believe in God, the Eternal Father. . . ." You see, they are wrong on the very first article of their faith. How could there be an Eternal Father? An Eternal Father implies an eternal progeny. That makes the Son as old as the Father, don't you see, and the Father no older than the Son, and that would be an impossibility. God is not an Eternal Father. He could not be an Eternal Father without he had an eternal progeny, and that would be impossible, don't you see? The very first article of their faith, then, is wrong, it starts wrong, lays down a wrong proposition. Of course, Jesus is the Son of God. When Christ was upon the earth during his personal ministry his will was perfectly resigned to the will of the Father, and he did nothing but the will of the Father all the days he was upon the earth. He conquered death and rose victorious. "All rule and all authority is given to me of Heaven and on earth." Again he said unto his apostles, "I do nothing save what I have seen my Father do." Jesus

then possessed all power, and he said, "All power is given to me in Heaven and on earth." God gave him to be head over all things, to his church which is his body and the fullness of him who encompasseth all and all. Jesus then was the Son of God, but that does not make God an Eternal Father. Well now the first number of my proposition is established.

My second proposition is that the Bible, as given to us by Christ and his apostles in Palestine, is a sufficient guide to salvation from sin. You can take all the creeds and professions of faith of the various churches of today, and every one of them concedes this position. They all concede that the Holy Scriptures contain all that is necessary to life and godliness so that what man may not read therein and prove thereby is not to be believed or is not requisite to salvation. This is all sufficient to guide men and women to salvation from sin. It is the only guide that has been given us. All Protestant denominations recognize it as a sufficient guide. When our people started out, it was not with a view to writing new Scripture but with a view of calling men back to the Scripture as written; to a church which was organized as was the one which Christ organized; to the Gospel just as it is taught in the new testament. We laid down as our fundamental doctrine that where the Bible speaks, we speak, and where the Bible is silent, we are silent, and that we will call Bible things by Bible names. This is the motto we started out upon, to search the Scriptures daily and adhere strictly to their teachings. I have called attention to what Protestantism has to say along these lines. I call attention now to the Scriptures themselves. I find recorded in 1st Timothy, 4th chapter, 13th to 16th verses:

> "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that they profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."

This was the doctrine taught by Paul to one of his most dearly beloved followers. If these Scriptures were sufficient

to save Timothy, why are they not sufficient to save us? The revelations of Joseph Smith were not in existence at this time, and yet this man was told to take heed unto the doctrine and by so doing he should save himself and those that heard him. I ask my friend if it will not do the same today. I want him to tell us here if it will not, why it will not. Again, in 2nd Timothy, chapter 3, verses 14 to 17:

> "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Now, if these Scriptures are sufficient to make Timothy wise unto salvation, why are they not sufficient to make you and me wise unto salvation? (Time.)

FIRST NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

PRESIDENT BEN. E. RICH.

I could ask for no greater blessing from God than that the prayer that was offered up in the beginning of these services should be heard and answered by our Father in Heaven. If I had a prayer to offer up right now, it would be that that prayer should ascend unto the Throne of God even as did the prayers of Cornelius of old; that you shall listen without prejudice; that error should be conquered; that truth should shine forth, and that the word of God should prevail and be made paramount in the hearts of all those who are present. I want to thank Brother Bunner for the great compliment he paid me, and to assure him that it is undeserved. I am not a debater. Some twenty-five or thirty years ago I alternated with a minister in holding two night's meetings, and this is the only thing that I have ever had in the shape of a debate. So far as my greatness in our Church is concerned, I want to say that I am only one of several hundred thousand of my brethren, and as to my education, I have none. My school days ended when I was a child of twelve years and when my parents lived a thousand miles from civilization and opportunities for gathering knowledge were not as they are now. I remember in some of the classes in the school which I attended we had to pass a book from the head to the foot of the class, taking turns in reading it. The crudest materials possible were gathered together by the good men and women who were so far from civilization in order to instruct their children and give them such knowledge as was within their reach. I doubt very much if I could pass the fourth grade if I were to take an examination in the schools of today, and I am quite certain I am entitled to no place as a speaker or as a theologian above thousands of my brethren who are mem-

bers of the Church. But I appear here tonight in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, your Savior and my Savior, the Captain of our salvation above whom no individual stands.

Brother Bunner has told you that we put Joseph Smith on an equality with Christ, but I want you to know that we teach no such doctrine. So far as placing men on an equality with the Lord Jesus Christ is concerned, let me say, I do not want you to believe for one moment that either I or my people believe anything of that kind. Probably Brother Bunner is a better expounder of his own faith than he is of mine, and if he will tell you what he believes and what his church teaches, I will be able to do the same for mine. There are a great many faiths in the world all based upon different passages in the Scriptures and growing out of particular and peculiar interpretations of them. If you will pardon me for relating a little story, I can tell you better in this way than in any other just what I mean. There was once a good, pious couple who had a wayward son, and they were very desirous indeed that the son should be converted. They prayed continually, and prevailed upon him to take a Bible with him as he went out into the woods to split rails. One day they heard a shouting of Hallelujah and Hosannah. The father and mother rushed out of the cottage and recognized the voice of their son. They witnessed him bounding from the woods as John the Baptist bounded from the wilderness. He had the axe upon his shoulder and the open Bible in his hand and he was shouting praises to the most High. The father and mother shouted praises to God that their son had at last seen the light. As he approached them, they said, "My son, are you converted?" and he answered, "Praise God, I have found the truth, I am converted." "Where did you find it, my boy, which portion of the Holy Word of God made such an impression upon your mind?" He opened the Bible and read:

> "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

and then said, "Praise God, I split no more rails." (Laughter.) Now my friends, there are many theological rail splitters in the different churches. We have listened tonight to the reading of a great many passages from the

Bible, and we have heard many private interpretations placed upon them. I am going to stand here tonight and speak words of simplicity so that when I am through you will remember something of what I have said, and I feel quite sure that you will remember little of what has been said by my opponent and that you will accept few of the private interpreations he has placed upoo the word of God. If you can remember and understand them, then you can understand Algebra before you have studied multiplication. In the letter that the Apostle Paul wrote to the Galatians, I find these words written to the branch of the Church at Galatia:

> "But there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

We gather from this that there had come to Paul information to the effect that there were some people in Galatia who were changing the word of God and who were perverting the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It was with the desire to warn this branch of the Church against such individuals that the Apostle wrote this letter, and his words are very positive and unmistakable. In order that he should not be misunderstood, he repeated them:

> "As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

In the face of this injunction, I feel most keenly the responsibility that rests upon me tonight. I stand here as a minister of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. I did not come here to play with words and to draw figures and to place private interpretations upon passages in the Bible. I stand here to preach the Gospel of the Savior and to tell you what we must do in order to be saved. Before entering upon a discussion of the principles of the Gospel, and an explanation of the organization of the Church, I want to tell you what I saw the other day in an old book store. It was a volume entitled "The History of the Confederacy." By perusing its pages, you may learn that once upon a time there existed a government known as the Confederate States

of America. Its first capitol was at Montgomery, Alabama, and afterwards at Richmond, Virginia. From this volume you may learn that a gentleman by the name of Jefferson Davis was president of this Confederacy; that in that government they had a Senate, they had a House of Representatives, they had a Judiciary, and all the equipment that goes to make up a government in the shape of a Republic. This is the way that government did exist, but after the surrender of Lee and after the declaration of peace, that Confederacy existed only in history. Without that president, without the authority of the Senate, without the authority of the House of Representatives together with the Judiciary, there was no Confederacy, there was nothing but a history of it. My friend has been reading to you tonight from the King James translation of the Holy Scriptures, and what is it? It is a volume containing the history of a church established by Christ. It is the history of a government that once existed. It will tell you that in this government there were placed apostles and prophets and Evangelists, Pastors and teachers. These officers were placed in that government by God, the Eternal Father, and don't let anyone make you believe that those who came into that organization after the death and resurrection of the Savior were not called of God. The very man who wrote the letter from which Brother Bunner quoted, namely, the Apostle Paul, declared with all his might to the Ephesians that he had been called of God by revelation. I know my brother will play upon words, by claiming that the name God was not mentioned, but when the Apostle Paul told the Ephesians that he was called by revelation, you may put it down that his call was from God, the Eternal Father, and if my brother wants to tell you that he was called by Christ, very well indeed. God the Eternal Father, gave unto Christ all power upon earth and in Heaven, and what Christ did, God did, and any commission that comes from Christ, comes from God. This book that my brother has been quoting from is a history of a government that once was; a history of what cannot be upon the earth without divinely inspired officers any more than the Confederacy could exist without duly authorized officers in that government. I say, then, that in so far as the new testament refers to the organziation of the

church of Christ, it is merely a history of that organization. I am here tonight to contend for the faith that was once delivered to the Saints. I do not mean in any way to reflect upon the Scripture in this comparison, but merely to show that the power of a government does not exist in the history of it during the days of its power. Brother Bunner says that none of these men who came into the latter part of that history were called of God, and yet he quotes their words as the word of God. Now God placed these officers in his church for a purpose (and when I say God's Church, I mean Christ's Church, and when I say Christ's Church, I mean God's Church, and I want to make it so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err in understanding it.) I told my brother once before in private conversation that I had been baptized and I had been vaccinated; that both took, and I am not afraid of anything on earth. So I expect to defend this proposition boldly. The Gospel of Jesus Christ should make all men free and courageous because it teaches that even if we lose our lives we will find them again, and that is the kind of faith I have. Will you reflect now for a moment upon the government in which we live? Let us dwell upon that subject for just a few minutes, and if I use all of my time, it is my loss and Brother Bunner's gain, unless I can bring in a comparison in order to illustrate a point bearing directly upon this discussion. You know there are foreigners by the thousands, yes, by the millions, coming into this government of ours. This government was organized by law, and it is perpetuated by law. It is very jealous of its laws, because if it had no law, if it were not regulated in just one way, then anarchy would run rampant throughout the length and breadth of the land. There is a way and manner in which the Germans, the Frenchmen, the Englishmen, the Italians and the Irish (and I say that with a smile because there is considerable of that blood in my make-up, which together with my father's blood from Kentucky make a pretty warm mixture) may become citizens of this Republic. But there is only one way to become a citizen. We have forty-eight free and independent States in this government and if a man lands in New York and asks what the requirements are to become a citizen, the requirements made of him will be the same as in any

other State in the Union. He may go off in search of an easier way. He may come here to West Virginia in the hope of finding an easier way, but he will not find it. There is but one way, one kind of officers, and the same routine to go through. He may go on to Illinois, he may cross over into the Rocky Mountains, go to Idaho or Utah; he may continue his search into California; go down to Arizona, cross back by way of New Orleans up into Tennessee and back into New York where he began his investigation, then he may continue on to the northern extremity of this great Republic, but he will return and say there is but one way, one kind of officer, one routine that has been mapped out by law for a person to become a citizen of this Republic and he must fulfil the requirements of that law. But some man may come along and probably find the commission of some individual who had presided here as judge (this is the proper court-room I believe, or the one above this) and who was once empowered to administer the law to individuals in taking out their papers with a view to becoming citizens of the United States. The judge may have died and some other man may have found his commission, he may have read it over, and made himself acquainted with the law and wording of the oath. He might open court some place and some foreigners may be told by someone that this man could issue the papers. They go before him and he administers the oath and issues the papers and those innocent foreigners may think, having acted in good faith, that they are indeed citizens of the United States. But let me ask you, would they be citizens of the United States? Somebody would be punished if the individual were caught who had perpetrated this crime, but there is only the one way to become a citizen of the United States, only one way to become a citizen of Great Britain or of Germany or any other government on the face of the earth. There is but one way, and law and order and sense and stability could not exist if there were more ways. So also in the government of God there is but one way, one faith, one baptism, and it is just as necessary that the laws governing the Kingdom of God should be administered by properly authorized officers as that the laws of this or any other government should be administered by properly authorized officers. What shape is

Christianity in today? You can become a supposed citizen of the Kingdom of God in as many ways as there are creeds, but God Almighty has declared that He has but one way. While you admit it is absolutely necessary that there should be but one way in which one may become a citizen under any government of the earth in order that law and order may stand, are you willing to admit that any old way will do and is good enough for God when it is written that God's House is a house of order, and that He is not the author of confusion? If God is not the author of confusion, he is not the author of all this quarreling in religion, and yet all religious denominations base their faiths upon their interpretation of the Scripture which we are contending is not sufficient for our guidance. In the book of the prophet Amos it is written:

> "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

They are his agents just as the judge upon the bench is the agent of the United States of America to let foreigners in, and you may put it down that if there are no prophets just as the old testament said, "The people perish, perish for the word of God." You might just as well say that from the days of Jesus Christ there has been no one standing upon the face of the earth duly authorized to admit foreigners into the Kingdom of God, as to say there were no prophets after Christ, for no man has the right to such authority except he be called of God through a phophet. Mr. Bunner makes a play upon words when he says the apostles were not called of God, but that they were called of Christ. You never have read that in the new testament, and if this is his own interpretation of the matter, I would recommend that he reads, and that he pray over that passage from the prophet Peter in his epistle where he says that,

> "No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Mr. Bunner has given his private interpretation to every passage of Scripture he has used from beginning to end. I don't want you to think that I desire to criticize him too severely, but I want you to remember that there are theo-

logical rail splitters upon the earth. If I understand the word of God correctly, Jesus Christ gave gifts unto the children of men. He placed prophets and apostles in the church, and how could he have placed them in the church if there had been no prophets after his day? Paul declares they were for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. It is said in Corinthians that he placed prophets in the church, and yet Mr. Bunner says that there have been no prophets since Jesus Christ. He is in a worse mix-up upon this subject than when he says that God is not the Eternal Father. God is our Eternal Father. He is the Eternal One, and he is the Father of our Spirits. Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and in telling you this I am simply contending for the faith that was once delivered to the Saints, nothing more, nothing less. The Apostle Paul in these Scriptures says that one of these officers cannot say to another, I have no need of thee. The hand cannot say to the foot, I have no need of thee; but Brother Bunner has not done a thing to that body, he has stripped it from head to foot, and he has no more of that Gospel once delivered to the Saints than a man would have of a wagon if he simply exhibited a linch pin. I heard once of an individual who had met with many accidents. He had had one eye blown out and in the threshing machine he had lost an arm; he had lost a leg also, still after all these misfortunes the Lord spared his life and he hopped around the best way he could. He was looked upon as a wonderful man to live after losing so much of himself. One night he was at an experience meeting where each person present was telling what the Lord had done for him. The minister, whose mind dwelt upon the miraculous manner in which this cripple's life had been spared, asked him also to express his gratitude to God and tell the congregation what had been done for him. He arose, stood upon his one foot, steadied himself with his one hand and gazed around at the audience with his one eye, then with a trembling voice he said, "Well, brethren, he has damned near ruined me." (Laughter.) Brother Bunner claims he has the body of

Christ, but he has amputated it to such an extent that the individual to whom I have referred, with all his amputations, would be fit for an artist's model compared with what Brother Bunner presents to you tonight as the body of Christ, as seen through his church organization. Brother Bunner claims these officers in the church are no longer needed, but God placed them in the church for the work of the ministry. Did Paul know what he was about when he said that they were placed in the church for the work of the ministry and for the edifying of the body of Christ? If he did, it is necessary for these officers to remain in the church, for according to the language of the Scriptures they were placed there for a purpose, and were to remain in the church until we all come to a unity of the faith. Have we all come to a unity of the faith? Brother Bunner and myself evidently have not, and I suppose if we were to take a vote here tonight you would be ashamed to say that you were all in a unity of the faith; yet Jesus Christ placed these officers in the church for this purpose. Why did he place them in the Church for this purpose? Simply because he knew that as long as Israel had prophets among them they were a united people. That after the prophets went to sleep the people wandered from unity, and that when Christ came he found the Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenees, and God only knows what other sees. If Jesus Christ would come back today, He would find a similar condition to that which existed when He came before. He would find the Baptists, Methodists, Catholics, and hundreds of theological rail splitters. Why should they be divided in this way? Because there was a period in the world's history between the time when the Church established by Christ was upon the earth with properly authorized officers and the present, when there were no prophets, and the people wandered in spiritual darkness. Christ knew that the people would be divided unless phophets should remain among them until they all came to the unity of the faith. He had another reason for placing these officers in His Church, and that was to keep us from being tossed to and fro, from being deceived, from being carried about by every wind of doctrine taught by men, as we are informed by Paul in his message to the Ephesians, the fourth chapter. Now those who do not believe in apostles and prophets are

tossed to and fro. They hang their faith upon some passage of the Scripture just like the rail splitter found something that suited him, and he wove his faith around that one passage. When Jesus Christ called his apostles together after his resurrection and was about to leave them, He told them to tarry in Jerusalem until they had received this great power, and when they had received it, they should have the power of drawing men to them and of bringing the world more nearly to a unity of the faith. He knew that even his apostles were not authorized to teach His Gospel until that Spirit of Revelation from God Almighty had come and rested down upon them, because the Lord will do nothing save he revealeth His mind and will to the prophets as God declares in Amos 3:7, for they are God's agents to men. To say, therefore, that the spirit of prophecy has left the earth is equal to saying that the testimony of Jesus has left the earth, because we are taught in the 19th chapter of Revelation "that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy," and the man who has not the spirit of prophecy has not a testimony of Jesus, that is all there is about it. When these apostles received that spirit on the day of Pentecost, they lifted up their voices and they taught what constituted a belief in the Lord Jesus Christ, namely, faith, repentance from sin, baptism for the remission of sins, and the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. These were necessary before one could become a citizen of the Kingdom of God. Read the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and there you will find the requirements, and if you will fill all these requirements, then you will be filled with the spirit of prophecy. These were the principles taught by Peter himself, the man who went down into the land of Samaria and imparted the gift of the Holy Spirit to the believers by the laying on of hands. Faith, repentance, bapaism, and the laying on of hands, are enumerated by the Apostle Paul as the doctrines taught by Christ. The Apostle John also in writing that sweet epistle to the elect lady makes use of these words:

> "He that abideth not in the doctrine of Jesus Christ hath not God, but he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the Father and the Son."

That is the plan of Heaven, that is the way to become initi-

ated into the Church of Christ, and no man can initiate another man into the Church unless he possesses that testimony of Jesus, which constitutes the spirit of prophecy, or in other words, unless he is a prophet or has been ordained by a prophet of God. No man can act as God's agent unless he is called of God, and if he has that spirit and that authority, he has the spirit of prophecy and can prophecy whenever God's spirit moves upon him. That is the faith that was once delivered to the Saints.

Now I have not talked quite as long as Brother Bunner did, but I pray that I have talked somewhat intelligently to you. I am one of the common people, and talk common sense and I want to feel that you know that I am terribly in earnest in the doctrine that I am teaching. I want to say again that Brother Bunner may tell you what he believes, but he cannot tell you what I believe, and when he says that we believe Joseph Smith stands above Christ, he tells you that which is not true. I dare him to believe in Christ as I believe in him, the same yesterday, today, tomorrow and forever. Christ is the one to whom God gave all power on earth and in Heaven. He was a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, nothwithstanding the garbled extracts of old Scripture which have been quoted to you. Christ did not have to wait until he returned to His Father, into the Holy of Holies, before receiving the High Priesthood, but it was given to Him while He was upon the earth. There was no power that He did not hold, there was no authority that He did not have given to Him, and in this respect Brother Bunner's belief in Christ is weak and sickening. Christ performed His mission upon the earth, then He ascended upon High and gave gifts to men to be exercised by them for the good of His Church. He placed authorized servants in His Church, and they are necessary as long as there is a foreigner to be initiated as a member of the government of God, and don't you believe that anything Christ placed in the Church is not necessary. There is not an organization upon the earth that is not governed by a one way proposition. In all the lodges there is but one way. In all the governments there is but one way, and in the Kingdom of God there is but one way, and it is your duty to search out that one way. Your Father has promised you that if you

will pray earnestly with a sincere heart, if you will plead with Him for information, He will condescend to give you the inspiration of that one way, but you will never get it worlds without end so long as you keep in your hearts a belief that prophets and the spirit of prophecy are not necessary in the Church of Christ. Without them this book (the Bible) is a history of an organization that once existed. This book can give you good counsel, but this book cannot baptize you, and baptism is essential to salvation. If you are baptized by one who has no authority, you will be in the same position as the people were whom Paul found, as mentioned in the 19th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, who had been baptized by someone with no authority perhaps and consequently were not enjoying the blessings of the Gospel. The apostle interpreted the word of God for them by the power of his apostleship, and baptized them again, being a divinely authorized servant of God, called by revelation, according to his own testimony, notwithstanding what Brother Bunner has said to you of Christ being last, and they enjoyed the fruits of the Gospel. Don't let anyone make you believe that the arm of God has been shortened or that He is a respecter of persons, or that He is a changeable person, because He is not. He is the same yesterday, today and forever, and as He gave apostles and prophets to the people who lived in days of old, so He gave them to the Church that was organized in the meridian of time under the direction and immediate supervision of the Savior and just so He must give them, to be just to all people in all lands and in all days, for it is by means of His prophets that He communicates His will to His subjects. Now my friends, sometime ago I promised the Lord that if He would help me to speak three quarters of an hour I would not try to speak longer. God bless you. Amen.

SECOND NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

Moderators, Fellow Debater, and Respectful Audience, I am grateful for having this privilege of appearing before you again tonight. You have heard the question read which we are discussing, and the proposition which I am affirming. I want to say that in all my correspondence with Mr. Rich it was impossible to arrange a question, though our correspondence was very pleasant, but when we met here in Fairmont we decided upon this proposition. I suppose in speaking of him I should say President Rich. He sometimes calls me Brother. I have a long time ago decided not to do anything I could not conscientiously do. I am satisfied that my friend cannot call me Brother conscientiously in the Scriptural sense of that word. If he believes his doctrine then he does not consider me a Christian from the simple fact that he has been baptized and it took, and according to his theory I have never been baptized and hence I am not a Christian. I have not been baptized by a man who was called of God as was Aaron, nor by a man holding such authority. I was baptized by a man who was called of God according to the Bible, and also according to my friend's own Book of Revelations, as I will show you later. This Book of Revelations was given for the government of the Church which my friend represents, and according to it I am properly called. He will not think hard of me if I quote his own book to show that my authority is as good as his. As I said in the beginning, while we had a very pleasant correspondence we could not agree upon a proposition. I tried to get him to allow me to affirm a proposition during certain nights of the debate and to have him affirm a proposition during an equal number of nights, and this he would not consent to. He would not affirm any proposition on the ground that he was not anxious for a debate. I tried,

therefore, to frame a proposition which should be recognized by his church as a fair one, and when we met to arrange for this debate we agreed upon the one which has been read in your hearing tonight. When I agreed to affirm this proposition, Mr. Rich said it would cover all the ground of differences between us, and I, of course, was willing to accept it with this understanding. This is why I have accepted the affirmative and led off in this discussion, and it was understood that it was to cover all the ground of difference between us. It will necessarily then bring his church under investigation though that does not seem to be implied in the technical wording of the proposition.

Now so far as my speech of last evening was concerned, I want to say that my friend did not reply to a single, solitary argument. The speech stands unassailed, and it stands unassailable. I mentioned specific points upon which I asked him to meet me and these points were not touched in his opening address. I asked him to try to show that the ground which I occupied is not well taken. It is true that he made a little capital out of what I said about the Eternal Father. I am not sure that he fairly understood my position along that line. I made no blunder at all when I said what I did concerning the Eternal Father. Some people do not understand the difference between the Eternal God and the Eternal Father. I believe in the Eternal God. I believe that God is from everlasting to everlasting, that he is without beginning of days, but that he is an Eternal Father, I do not believe. But this is the first article of Mr. Rich's faith. It is utterly impossible for a being to be an Eternal Father for such a being could not exist. He could not be an Eternal Father without having Eternal offspring, and God has Eternal Offspring only by creation. The angels of God are his children by his creation, and man is also a Son of God by creation. All mankind are Sons of God by creation. As the Scriptures state, we all have one Father, one God has created us; well, then, he is the Father of our spirits. That is, he is the creator of our spirits. Our spirits came from him. As the Father of spirits, he is the Father of Jesus Christ, but God is his Father also by natural generation. Jesus Christ is the Son of God by natural generation; he partook of the divine nature of his Father, and he

was a being, therefore, as divine as his Father, though human through his mother, hence he could be put on an equality with God because he was the true Son of God. But man cannot be put on the same equality with God because he is the Son of God only by creation. Christ humbled himself in becoming an earthly Son and became obedient to the will of his Father, but don't you see from this interpretation that there could be no Eternal Father unless there was an Eternal progeny. Now this is the first article of his faith, and the man who wrote it claimed to be inspired, and therefore could not write untruth, and in the very first article of his faith we find the evidence that he was not divinely inspired and that his church occupies a false position. This is enough in itself against his system of religion to set it aside. Of course, I was very much amused last night by the stories which he told, and I hope he will continue along that line and entertain this audience in that way, and I will try to do the work of proving the proposition and supply the facts from which proper conclusions must be drawn.

Now he said last evening we could not have the church without apostles and prophets and Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers; and all of these miraculous endowments and gifts and persons that constitute a part of the church which he represents, and that he argues without which a church does not exist. He gave an illustration of a man who had lost an eye, an arm and so on, and the application which he made of this story was that in my argument I had ruined the church of Christ. Well now I expect to ruin his church before this investigation is done with. Now let us see what he has to say upon the subject. He argues that these different officers were placed in the church for a certain purpose, that they were to remain until we all came to a unity of the faith. Now let us suppose that we have not yet come to a unity of the faith. If we have not, why these individuals are still necessary, but there will come a day when we will all come to a unity of the faith, and when that day comes these officers will be done away with. Well then at that time that church will be ruined as my friend claims I have already ruined it because these officers will no longer be necessary and will be done away with, don't you see? Then his argument that the church could not exist without

these officers is false, for when we do come to a unity of the faith they are all to be done away with. I want you to know that we are arguing a proposition here and that our argument must stand the test. These officers were put in the church for an object and whenever that object is accomplished they will be done away with. My friend claims that we were to have prophets and apostles so that we should not be carried about by every wind of doctrine, and it seems to me that his doctrine is pretty windy.

Mr. Rich laid particular stress upon the fact that Christ gave gifts unto men at the same time he gave apostles and prophets. What was the object of these gifts and of these officers? The object was for the perfecting of the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ, etc., in order that we be "no longer children tossed to and fro and carried away by every wind of doctrine and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Mr. Rich claims because we have not these officers in our church and we do not claim to exercise miraculous gifts that we are going to be carried away by every wind of doctrine, and that we are, therefore, in that condition at the present time. But what about the church that claims to be presided over by apostles and prophets and Evangelists? The church that is so presided over should not have any differences of opinion and should not be carried about by every wind of doctrine, but my friend knows that Mormonism is not united, that there are ten different factions of Mormonism today, and that all of these factions claim to have spiritual gifts and apostles and prophets, in their organization. We are here tonight representatives of the Reorganite Church, and there are Brighamites, Strangites and Hedrakites, and various other outgrowths from the church that was established by Joseph Smith. All of these organizations, as I have said, claim to have their apostles and prophets and Evangelists and pastors and teachers, and all of them claim to exercise miraculous gifts, but are they to a unity of the faith? My friend argues that these things were placed in the church to bring us to a unity of the faith, why do they not then apply to his own organization? I want my friend to show us when these different organizations are going to come to a unity of the faith. Among themselves

they are as much at variance with each other as the people were during the personal ministry of Christ or as the other churches are today, yet they claim to have in their organization the things that should make them united. They not only have apostles and prophets but every one of these factions claim to be inspired of God, each and every man of them, every one of their ministers. If you talked with one faction they will tell you that they are right and that all the others are wrong, and yet each of them will claim that he was called of God as was Aaron, called by revelation to minister in the Gospel of Christ. When I asked whether I have the right to preach, they tell me no, you are not called of God as was Aaron, but we have been called of God and we are inspired. The Holy Spirit speaks through us, we are the people, and this is the reply that comes from every faction of Mormonism. We are the people and we are inspired to do our work, but at the same time they are the worst divided people I know of on earth. They claim also to perform miracles as they were performed by apostles in premature times. These are performed by all these various factions of Mormonism, but when you start in search of a Mormon miracle, you will find that it is just beyond you, it is over in some other section that one has been performed. You will never come upon one in your search, you never overtake it, do you see? That is not all. They recognize Joseph Smith as a prophet sent from God, yet one sect will accept one revelation that he is supposed to have been given, and another sect will deny that one, but claim to accept some other that belongs to their particular creed. Joseph Smith himself said that some revelations were from God, some from man, and some from the devil, and we, of course, as a people believe that all his authorized revelations came from his own heart and not from God, so they have their prophets and apostles, and why are they in this confused condition? Why does distinction exist among them? Having apostles, prophets, and teachers, we would expect them to be united in the spirit, perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, but they are divided, terribly divided, today.

Well now, we will just leave this matter with you along this line and call your attention to another statement. They

tell us that they lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, but I want to say to you that their Book of Mormon does not teach the laying on of hands, does not make the laying on of hands necessary for the gift of the Holy Ghost. Take, if you please, the baptism of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery, Smith baptized Cowdery and Cowdery turned around and baptized Smith. That is the way Mormonism started in this country. As soon as they arose from baptism, the Holy Spirit came upon Cowdery and he prophesied many things concerning the church of the Lord. This was, you see, the Holy Spirit which came on this occasion and it came without the laying on of hands. It is true that they claim an angel of the Lord had commanded them to baptize each other, but we would only expect that they should have received this remarkable manifestation of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands. There cannot, however, be found in all the history of the Mormon church an instance where the Holy Spirit was ever imparted to them as it was upon the people of Samaria in the days of Christ. I don't care what school of Mormonism they were taught in. They never baptized an individual in their lives and laid their hands upon them as Peter and John did when they were sent down to Samaria and saw the same manifestations of the Gift of the Spirit. When these two apostles were sent to Samaria, they laid their hands upon the people and they received the Holy Ghost. These were the people who had been baptized by Philip, and you will find it recorded in the Scripture how Simon, who stood by, when he saw the power of the Holy Spirit made manifest, wanted to buy that power. Simon saw something with his natural eyes when the Holy Spirit rested upon these people. He heard them speak in new tongues, tongues that they had not studied and had no power to use except under the influence of this Spirit. It was not something he was told about. This manifestation of the Spirit appealed to the senses of Simon, the Sorcerer, and he wanted that power which he had seen made manifest. If then you were to lay your hands upon someone to impart to them the Holy Spirit, you should be able to see what Simon the Sorcerer saw, and unless our Mormon friends can impart the Holy Spirit in that way we will not be convinced. Mark you the people who were at Samaria saw something.

They heard them speak with tongues, and wherever the Holy Spirit was so imparted by the apostles of Christ those who stood by saw with their natural senses the manifestations of these miraculous gifts. Now there were two ways in the days of the apostles by which the Holy Spirit was made manifest, by baptism and by the laying on of hands, and the same manifestations were seen at the imparting of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands as by baptism. Take the manifestation on the Day of Pentecost, and it is similar to the manifestation at the house of Cornelius. The Holy Spirit filled all the house where they were sitting, and all the people present saw the manifestation of this power. It gave the people utterance, and they spoke in new tongues. It fell upon all those who heard the word of those who were under its influence, and they heard them speak in new tongues and interpreted what they said. They spoke in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance, and all the people who were present heard and understood, and saw the miraculous endowment that was given by the Holy Spirit. This idea of conferring the Holy Spirit today by the laying on of hands is simply absurd unless it can show to the assembled multitude the same sort of manifestation as was shown at Pentecost. It is simply false, and we will not accept it unless they can come and measure up in their work to the standard set by the Scripture. Mr. Rich said that the Bible is simply a history of something that took place ages ago, and that so far as the Scriptures are concerned they are only a history of the past, not a history of anything in the future, or of anything in the present, but a history of things that have long since passed away. If that is true, why does my friend quote the Scripture and apply its teachings to himself? Why does he quote the Scripture where it says, "He gave gifts unto men" and apply this Scripture to himself and his people today? Why does he quote from the new testament and apply those Scriptural passages to his church if that book is only a history of the past, while his church is an organization existing in the present, why use the book for present purposes if it is only a history of something that once existed? History is not law, it is a record of events that have passed. It is not something to be obeyed. You do not obey history, but this book called the new testament

Scripture is not a history because it enjoins upon us all the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ that we must obey for our salvation, and it contains all the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ that we know anything about. Take this book, we make the Bible the kind of book Mr. Rich tries to make it out to be, and it amounts to no kind of a doctrinal book whatever. Then there are no commandments for the people of the present, all have been given for the people of the past.

Now I established the proposition last night that Jesus Christ was the last of all the prophets, and I am going to call attention to the last argument that I made that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent of God. I quoted from Matthew that declaration, and I also quoted the statement of the Savior when he said:

> "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!"

Now in these Scriptures I admitted that Christ was sent to the House of Israel and that they would not be gathered, so he left them and gave His teachings to other members of the House of Israel, but not to the Jew. The Scripture which we read from Matthew, declared that God has sent his prophets and last of all his Son to the nation of Israel, that the nation of Israel was the vineyard that was established and let out to the husbandmen and that when the time came to reap the fruit he sent certain of his servants. These servants represented the prophets of the old testament and they were killed by the husbandmen. Then other prophets were sent later than the days of Moses, and these also were killed, and finally last of all he sent his Son. I challenged Mr. Rich to get in another prophet after "last of all" and he left this argument entirely unassailed. He has failed to get in anything after "last of all." The last one he sent to the nation of Israel was his Son, and he has not sent another prophet since he sent his Son. Now Jesus Christ kept his disciples in this vineyard so long as he stayed in mortality, but after he ascended to his Father his disciples were taken away from the vineyard and sent out in a wider ministry.

Of course, Paul was called of God, and God authorized all the apostles, and they were prophets, but I have shown that these men were called directly of Christ, he having received this authority from his Father. Here is the proposition as I laid it down last night, and I repeat it now that when Christ was here on earth he came to do the will of the Father in Heaven and to glorify the Father, and that the call he made of his apostles was the direct call of Jesus Christ though authorized by the Father. During the entire personal ministry of Christ from his birth in Bethlehem, in Judea, to his crucifixion on the cross the will of Christ was perfectly resigned to the will of the Father who was absorbed in doing the will of his Father in Heaven. "Not my will but thy will be done," was his prayer continually. Now after this he expired on the cross and in doing this he took the old will out of the way that he might establish a second will which was the new covenant by which men might be sanctified. After this when he ascended on High God authorized everything that Christ did and recognized it, and left Christ to prosecute his business as the new King on the Throne.

SECOND NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

President Ben. E. Rich.

The proposition which we are here to discuss has been read in your hearing by one of the moderators, and Brother Bunner (I will insist on calling him Brother) has told you what ground he intends it shall cover. I do not think it will hurt him any to have me call him Brother even after what he has said upon that subject. It reminds me of a story I once heard of a negro who once raised his hat to George Washington on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. Washington raised his hat in return. A friend who was walking with him turned to Washington and said, "Why is it, Mr. President, that you raise your hat to a negro?" "I want you to understand, sir," replied Wahington, "that I will not allow a negro to outdo me in politeness." But coming to the subject, I was under the impression Brother Bunner had almost run out of arguments last night, and he has succeeded tonight in convincing me that such was the case. His speech tonight made me wonder for a few moments whether we were here to discuss the principles of Mormonism and the organization of the Mormon Church, or whether we were here to consider from the Scriptural standpoint the proposition which has been signed by both of us. I reminded you last night that when it came to expounding my faith, I could probably do that better than he. I would not like to have my faith measured by his interpretation of it, so I intend tonight to take up the thread of argument where I left off last night and to try and convince you that prophets are as necessary today to have in the Church of Jesus Christ as they were in former days. When I am through with that proposition, I will pay special attention to other things that drop in on the line. I spoke to you at some length upon the way in which the church was organized anciently and of some of the powers that were founded in the church. I tried to im-

press upon your minds the weight of the argument found in Amos that prophets are the agents of God, and that He will do nothing save He reveals His mind and will to His servants, the prophets. I want to impress upon your minds once more that this is the way God has of doing business with His children, and it is to His authorized agents that He reveals His mind and will. They have the true testimony of Jesus Christ, and consequently they have the spirit of prophecy. A person who is working under that spirit can be used to foretell future events; to tell things past, present, as well as to foretell events to come in the future. This spirit of prophecy was given to the authorities that were found in the Church of Christ when He had His church upon the earth. Jesus was very particular to instruct His disciples not to go out and preach until they did have this spirit that emanates from the Father, the spirit of Revelation, if you please, that spirit which takes of things from the Father and reveals them to the one who enjoys the sweet influence of that spirit. When Christ commanded them to tarry at Jerusalem until they were endowed with this power, he was simply fulfilling the words of the Prophet Amos, that the Lord would not allow instructions to go out to His people except as they came through Him to His prophets, who were properly chosen and appointed to speak as they were moved upon by the Holy Spirit. The same policy carried out in the Mosaic dispensation was carried out in the Church of Christ, and though these men had been divinely called and had been appointed to their proper offices in the church, Christ would not allow them to go out to teach His Gospel until they had received the other Comforter and had been given that spirit of prophecy which is the testimony of Jesus. This only goes to show that God does nothing in His work upon the earth pertaining to the salvation of the souls of men concerning the work of the ministry without giving men the spirit of prophecy. As I have said before, a person who enjoys this spirit may, while he is under its influence, foretell the coming of future events as well as speak of things that are in the present. God may use the tongue of such a man. He may control his mind and give him the power that He once gave to His apostles in order that His people may be blessed through the ministry of such a prophet. I

have but one purpose in thus insisting repeatedly upon this fact, that is to convince you that prophets are necessary in our day as much so as in any of the days that have passed. Do not lose sight of this one fact that these prophets are the agents of God and that where they are not, the people perish, perish for want of the word of God. And no matter what Brother Bunner may say to you, he is not going to cause me to deviate or wander away from this one thought until I have planted it into your hearts so deeply that any ridicule that may come from his lips concerning my faith will not be sufficient to root it out of your hearts. Any man who will ridicule one of God's chosen agents, or who will speak slightingly of the necessity of having one of God's agents among the people, or who will deny the existence of the spiritual powers and gifts of the Gospel as Christ left it upon the earth, is a dangerous leader in the spiritual affairs of life. Such a man, if he had lived two thousand years ago, would have pointed a finger of scorn at Christ and derided His labors and those of His apostles, for Christ and His apostles stood upon the earth claiming that prophets were necessary because Israel had been for generations in a state of spiritual sleep, and men of Mr. Bunner's class ridiculed and opposed Him. Now this play of his,—and Oh, how he does play upon it,—"last of all," what shall we say of that? He has read you these words, "last of all He sent His Son," and has said that I cannot get around that "last of all." That statement is just as ridiculous as though I should burst out crying and when it was asked me why I cry, I should say to you that "Jesus wept" and we must be like Him. Brother Bunner has told you truthfully that the vineyard there mentioned represented the House of Israel; that Israel had been for ages the keeper of God's words. Through that race God sent His prophets upon the earth and spoke to the world through the chosen people. To this people He sent His agents, chosen from among them and authorized them to speak in His name. Instead of treating His prophets as God's agents, who were sent into the vineyard, Israel had from generation to generation killed them and rejected their message, and after all these years, "last of all" God sent His Son *to this same house of Israel.* They rejected His ministry as they had rejected the ministry of

the prophets who preceded Him, but this does not mean that God could send no other prophets to any other people, because this people had rejected the work of the prophets and also of the Son of God. God did not say that He would never send to earth another prophet, and in this parable of the Savior we are made to understand that the House of Israel was rejected of God when they had rejected His Son. This was the vineyard, this House of Israel, and after God had tried these husbandmen with so many agents and *lastly with His Son*, He was to send His army to destroy these wicked husbandmen. When Christ came to dwell in mortality, He went among the lost sheep of the House of Israel. That was His mission. He instructed His disciples to go to none else, and kept them in His vineyard so long as He dwelt in mortality. But does the work stop here? After Israel had rejected Him, was Israel not rejected by Him; were not His apostles sent away from the House of Israel and to another people? Brother Bunner only reads that portion of the Scripture that suits his purpose, and if we were to read a little farther we would learn that after they had killed the Son, the agent of God, He would send His army and would miserably destroy those wicked men and would let out His vineyard unto other husbandmen who should render Him the fruits in their season. This is a verse which does not suit the purpose of my Brother, and so he does not read it. Here is another verse that he might have read, because it throws light upon this discussion:

> "And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them. But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet."

Brother Bunner knows perfectly well that the vineyard referred to in this parable was the House of Israel, and he knows perfectly well that shortly after the crucifixion of Christ the prediction that was made to the Jews was fulfilled, that the Gospel was taken from them and was carried to the Gentiles who were on the outside of the vineyard. He could have told you this if he had been willing to state the truth plainly and not twisted it to give an interpretation for his private use. But he harped on that

"last of all," attempting to show that no other word could come from God to the people of the earth because the House of Israel had rejected the Christ. Why, Brother Bunner, it would take ten hundred millions of narrow minds like yours to shut the windows of Heaven, and say to God Almighty that no prophet shall again come upon the earth. My friends, you never did hear a man who was in the possession of the spirit of Christ use his time and ability in belittling any gift or any power that Jesus once placed upon the earth, or in attempting to withdraw any commission which Christ once gave to men. But in every period of the world's history there have been those upon the earth who denied the existence of spiritual gifts. The condemnation of every generation when God has had prophets upon the earth has been that the people have believed in dead prophets but were ready and willing to deny the existence of living ones and to put them to death. Probably the most radical sermon ever preached by Christ, is that one recorded in the 23d chapter of St. Matthew. These words that fell from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth are the very opposite in character from the sermon He delivered on the Mount, yet He was justified in speaking every word that He uttered. In this sermon He was speaking to that class of preachers who were engaged in denying the existence of living prophets, and yet pretended to believe on the dead ones. When He called them a generation of vipers and told them that they would encompass sea and land in order to make one convert and then it simply made said convert many fold more the child of hell than he was before, He had in mind the condition that exists today and has always existed among those who denied the spirit of prophecy. He told this people that their sin was the same as that of other generations in that they professed to believe in former day prophets but stood ready and willing to crucify the living prophet. By their acts they demonstrated that they were not true followers of Christ. Take it in the days of Noah. There were preachers of that period who did not believe Noah was a prophet. Indeed there were very few who did believe he had been sent of God with a message to the world. But God gave to him a revelation that made him a prophet, and sent him

to the world to warn the world against the destruction that must come upon it, unless men should turn from their sins and obey the word of God as spoken through His prophet. By means of revelation God showed to Noah a plan for the salvation of those who would accept His word, and all the derision that was hurled at Him, and all the doubt of His word, and all the ridicule, were not sufficient to destroy His prophecy or to make it fall to the earth unfulfilled. Noah was indeed a prophet of God and had received through the spirit of prophecy the word that he was to speak to the people, and God recognized him, and in His own due time fulfilled every bit of the prophecy which Noah had uttered. If it were necessary that God should send prophets in that generation, is it not equally likely that they are needed in every generation and among every people? If there are no more prophets going to come upon the earth, as Brother Bunner states, then it is not true that "though the Heavens and the earth may pass away, not one jot or tittle of the sayings of Christ shall fall to the earth unfulfilled." We are told in the Scriptures that before the second coming of Christ, God Almighty will raise up a prophet like unto Noah and will give that prophet a revelation, and that He will give him a message of salvation to carry to the world for the instruction of mankind. Men may deride and ridicule as they did in the days of Noah, but notwithstanding all this, God's word will be fulfilled. Christ said, "*as it was in the days of Noah so shall it be in the days of the coming of the Son of Man.*" I have shown you how it was in the days of Noah; that a prophet was sent by God to warn the people that they must repent of their sins and heed the word that was spoken to them by His prophet or that they would be destroyed. So it is to be in the last days before the second coming of the Son of Man. Now of course my friend, Brother Bunner, may stand up here and say if this argument is well founded there will have to be a flood. But I want to spare him that much time and trouble by reminding him that after the flood, God Almighty placed a rainbow in the Heaven as a covenant that never again would He destroy the earth by water. Christ knew of this promise and, therefore, did not have the flood in mind when

He stated "As it was in the days of Noah," but He knew the cry of repentence from sin must go out in all the world, that men should be left without excuse at the time of His coming, and that this cry could have no meaning save as it came from one called by revelation and authorized to speak in the name of God. I want to call your attention to one more thing just to show you how particular God is in recognizing His prophets. You remember the story of Saul of Tarsus: how he thought he was doing the will of the Father by persecuting the Saints. He was willing to send back unto the presence of the Father the spirit of that great missionary, Stephen. You will remember how willingly he held the clothes of those who stoned Stephen to death: how after that he carried in his pockets writs for all those who preached in the name of Christ. He was journeying on his road to Damascus to throw into prison any one that he found there preaching in the name of Christ, and it was while upon this journey that God taught him this lesson. You remember reading that he was stricken blind. He heard a voice saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" Saul had been honest, in all that he had done, maintained and believing he was doing the will of the Father in persecuting these people who were the followers of one whom he considered one of the greatest falsifiers who had ever lived. When this voice said unto him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" naturally he, filled as he was with honesty, responded, "Who are thou, Lord?" The voice of the meek and lowly One came back to him, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest, it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." Oh, what a vision must have passed before the mind of this Saul of Tarsus. How he must have remembered the terrible mistakes he had made by willingly holding the clothes of the mob while they stoned Stephen to death. Saul did not believe in modern revelation, nor in modern prophets. No wonder when this information was given him, even though it brought blindness, his honest voice cried back to Jesus, "What shall I do?" Notice now the answer which Jesus made to him; remember that Jesus had left upon the earth His authorized agents to act in His name. Whenever people ask this question of Him while He was in the flesh He answered, but now

He insisted that they recognize the authority of His chosen agents, so at this time He directed Saul to go to one of these chosen agents who would tell him what to do. What more beautiful example could we wish for than this, to show us how perfectly Christ respected His authority He had left in His Church? It would have been an easy matter for Jesus to tell Saul what to do, but He told him instead, to go into Damascus and that there he would learn what he should do. In order that He might fully establish this doctrine of revealing the things of God to men. His spirit moved upon Ananias and told this missionary that Saul was waiting for him. He sent him by revelation out "into the street which is called Straight," and told him to inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul of Tarsus, and that he should instruct Saul and minister unto him. This was modern revelation to Saul, it was modern revelation to Ananias. Every revelation is modern revelation to the age to which it is given, and there have been in every age in this world's history men who believe in former revelation, but who denied that there was any necessity for it in their day. Through this system of modern revelation Ananias was spoken to and Saul was spoken to, and why should that same spirit be confined to honest investigators of God's truth in other days or in other ages? God Almighty recognized Saul, because he was one of the honest searchers for truth; He recognized His agent, Ananias, because he had been called by revelation and had been set apart by proper authority to be a prophet of God. Now, my friends, I would have you remember that this incident which I have related with some care took place after the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, yet Brother Bunner is trying to have you believe that there has been no prophet of God upon the earth since the days of Christ and that no one after His time has had the right to speak in His name or has possessed the spirit of prophecy. All power on earth and in Heaven, as I told you last night, was given to Christ. God recognized everything that Christ did. You might say, to use the modern term, that He gave Him a power of attorney to do everything that was right, and whatever Christ did, God did, and don't you let my friend here convince you to the contrary. Let me emphasize this

truth which I have proved from these illustrations. God always recognizes the authority of His chosen servants, the prophets, in administering the affairs of His government. May the Lord bless you. Amen.

SECOND NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

I want to say to the audience that I meant no disrespect to Mr. Rich when I spoke as I did concerning the word "brother." I simply meant that he could not conscientiously recognize me as a brother from his viewpoint because he could not recognize me as a Christian, for I have not obeyed the Gospel through the channel which he claims men should be called in order that baptism should be valid. But so far as recognizing him as a brother is concerned, I have no objection so long as he will allow me to recognize him as a brother with the view that if I miss him in Christ I will find him in Adam. In this sense of the word, I am willing to recognize him as a brother.

He has made several statements here tonight concerning prophets of God and how terribly wicked it would be for any individual to belittle any gift of God or to call in question the right of men of the present day to exercise these gifts. He read this quotation from Amos, 3rd chapter and 7th verse:

> "Surely the Lord God will do nothing except he revealeth his secrets unto his servants, the prophets."

Now of course I believe this Scripture as much as my friend does. I believe this statement as it is recorded here, but this is in the Old Testament and applies to the prophets under the Old Testament, not to those under the New. Amos was a prophet of God under the old covenant, and what Amos means to say here is that under that covenant God would do nothing except He revealed Himself through His prophets, but we are discussing the question of the Christian era, and I have shown you that Moses said that God would raise up from among his brethren a prophet like unto Moses who should be a law giver to the people, and that

in that day the people should harken to the voice of this prophet and to no other, and they did harken. I have shown you that that prophet was Jesus Christ. I insist again upon the exact wording of this statement that every soul that heareth not this prophet shall be destroyed from among the people. I am willing to grant that God has always been willing to recognize the authority of His chosen servants. That is what we are contending for here tonight, that these men who were called by God and who gave us the words of Christ as they had received them from Him were His servants, and that they gave us a sufficient guide to salvation from sin. When these disciples were asked what men and women should do to be saved, they always gave the same answer. Was it necessary, therefore, that this answer should be changed after Christ went into Heaven? He left His authorized teachers among the people, and individuals who wanted to know what to do to be saved came to them and asked for information. These disciples would answer their question just like Jesus would have answered them if He had been here Himself, and just as they had heard Him answer that question many times. But these agents left us the written word, left us the answers which they had given to these questions, and I claim that is a sufficient guide to salvation from sin. Now I want to ask Mr. Rich what answer he would give to a person who would ask him what to do to be saved. We have the answer of the chosen apostles of Christ which I claim is sufficient. I want to ask Mr. Rich if he would give any other answer that the one which is here given or would you give an additional answer to what is here given? I want to know by what authority you would give this extra answer or that you would give a different answer than that given by these authorized agents of the Lord Jesus Christ? They claimed that they were able to give to the world the words of reconciliation which would make it possible for man to reconcile himself to God, and that their instructions were those delivered by Christ to the apostles in the beginning; that they went about through all the country teaching that which they had received, and that they afterwards left them for us in the New Testament Scripture. My friend claims here that he is an authorized agent, that he comes with a new Gospel

or with a different Gospel. I want him to tell us what that different Gospel is. Here now is something for him to do to answer this question for us. If you, as an authorized agent, were asked the question what should I do to be saved, what answer would you give? Now I want Mr. Rich to just show us, if he is an authorized agent of the Lord Jesus Christ, what change he would make in these Scriptures as given by Jesus Christ and His apostles in Palestine. Mr. Rich claims to be an authorized agent of Jesus Christ and claims the right to the exercise of miraculous gifts. I want to know why he does not exercise these gifts as they were exercised by the prophets or the apostles whom Christ left upon the earth as His agents. If you possess these gifts, Mr. Rich, we want you to convince us of that fact. Now this is what I want to know, it is what this audience wants to know. Now I want you to say in your next speech to this audience whether or not you possess these gifts, and whether or not you will exercise them for this audience. I want you to tell this audience what you would say if one cried out, what must I do to be saved; whether you will give him a different answer than is found in this New Testament Scripture, and, of course, we want you to state upon what authority you would give a different answer. I want you also to demonstrate your authority here to the people and confirm your claim just as the ancient ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ did. Now here is work for Brother Rich to do! but he cannot do it; he is not qualified for his work by the authority which these men held, and he cannot, therefore, do these things which we are asking him to do. There were false apostles in the day of the Christ, and these false apostles were tried out in the way that I am asking Brother Rich to allow us to try him out. We propose to try these Mormons by the divine rule which is given us here by God to prove whether they can do the things that they claim to do. Now this is what we want. I would not know today if I wanted to join the Latter Day Saints' Church, which faction to join because all their organizations, as I have shown you, tell you that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God and that they are the rightful successors in the church which he organized. Joseph Smith once said that if Brigham

Young were to get possession of the church he would lead it into hell. Brigham Young did get possession of the church which Mr. Rich represents, and he did lead it into hell, so one man told me the other day, and that it has never gotten out. Now I want to know, Mr. Rich, if you belong to a church in hell. Well, I belong to the Church of Christ, and that is the difference in our two churches. Now if Joseph Smith was a true prophet of God, certainly this prophecy should have been fulfilled along with the others, and if it was fulfilled, what has become of your church, Mr. Rich? He cannot laugh off my argument nor divert us from the main issue by telling us his foolish stories. His church is here upon trial, and we want solid argument. His church is up for investigation, and this people expect him to defend his position by solid argument. Now I repeat that he has not answered a single, solitary argument which I have made. He has attempted to explain the parable of the vineyard, but I want him to tell us that if that vineyard was taken from the people of Israel and given to another, who took it, whether it was done by Jesus Christ or by Joseph Smith.

We say that God did it when Christ sat on the right hand of the Father, and when the Gospel went forth from Jerusalem some few years after the organization of the church. Right here is where we take issue with the Mormon church, and this is what we want to know, and it is what this people wants to know. Did Christ take away this vineyard or did Joseph Smith? Now with reference to the prophecies of Joseph Smith, I want to say to you that he never uttered a single prophecy in his life that came true, not one, not one, and so far as his call was concerned and his talk about being called of God as was Aaron, his call was nothing similar to that of Aaron whatever. He did not demonstrate in a single instance that he possessed the spiritual or miraculous power that was possessed by the prophets of old. and so we see that his teaching is wrong, wrong on every point. We read in Galatians "that if any man preach unto you any other Gospel, let him be accursed," and that even if an angel of God came preaching another Gospel he would be accursed. I have shown you that all the factions of Mormonism are teaching another Gospel, and if an angel came down and talked with Joseph

Smith, he was a fallen angel because he brought another Gospel. My friend made a great fuss about this statement of Paul to the Galatians, but he only succeeded in convincing you that if any man preached another Gospel than the one which the apostle preached that the curse of God would rest upon him, and that Joseph Smith had preached such another Gospel, and, therefore, that the curse of God must rest upon him. Even if an angel from Heaven preached another Gospel, that he must be a fallen angel. The angels of darkness have had the power to appear clothed in light, and such an one might have appeared to Joseph Smith. What I want you to notice then, my friends, is that these people came out preaching another Gospel, and that when they claim that their Gospel was given to them by an angel, that he must have been a fallen angel because he brought another Gospel.

I want to say to you that Sidney Rigdon gave Joseph Smith that book called the Book of Mormon. Joseph Smith claimed it was John the Baptist, but I want to say to you that it was Sidney the Baptist. Now we would expect to find in this new book, if it came from God, truth that would then rightly apply, save men and women, and moreover would be necessary for the salvation of men. Now, either this Bible, which we are using, is sufficient for our salvation or it is not, and we must have an additional volume of Scripture. But in this Book of Mormon, which Joseph Smith claims he received from the angel, I want to say that there is not a single, solitary thing that they haven't taken from the book called the Bible, or which cannot be found directly or indirectly in its doctrines. You cannot put your finger upon one single passage of Scripture which is not taken from the Bible, and some of it taken word for word. In their Book of the Covenants they haven't one single, solitary thing that is to benefit mankind that they haven't stolen from the Scriptures and that I cannot find taught either by precept or example or illustration in them.

Now concerning Mr. Smith's priesthood, what shall we say? This angel who appeared to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery laid his hands upon their heads and conferred upon them the Priesthood. Then notice what happened. He told them that they should go into the water and that

Cowdery should baptize Joseph Smith and that Joseph Smith should then baptize Cowdery. Now mind you that the angel came first and laid his hands upon Smith and Cowdery and gave them the Priesthood, and that then after they baptized each other they laid their hands upon each other's head and conferred the Aaronic Priesthood upon each other. What does this mean? Was the angel's work a failure? This is what we want to know, or did these men get a double dose of the Aaronic Priesthood, that is what we want to know.

Another thing that I want you to notice is that there were offices in the church as organized by Joseph Smith that cannot be found in the Church of Christ. They cannot even be found in the Book of Mormon. The Book of Mormon knows nothing about a High Priest, and Joseph Smith usurped the Priesthood of Christ. Mr. Whitmer, one of the close followers of Joseph Smith, said that so far as the office of prophet, seer and revelator was concerned that there was no such office in the beginning of the church, but that Joseph Smith created this office and took upon himself this name after the church was organized. For this reason Mr. Whitmer and many others withdrew themselves from the church, claiming that Joseph Smith was a usurper of power. Joseph Smith claimed that he received additional revelation from God in order to establish the authority of these different officers, and that no man had a right to question his statement; yet I have shown you that the Book of Mormon knew nothing about a High Priest's office among men, and that the New Testament knew nothing about such an office, and yet that Joseph Smith established such an office in his church. Joseph Smith claimed to be called of God as was Aaron and to hold the Aaronic Priesthood, but he claimed also to possess the Melchisedek Priesthood. You see he usurped the Priesthood of Christ and set aside his authority and upsets all authority and takes possession of it himself. This is what these people are claiming continually. Now Mr. Rich needs to answer some of these things, and his illustrations about George Washington and the negro failed to illustrate. I tried to take notes upon what Mr. Rich had to say, but I found when I looked over them that they are not notes but nonsense.

I want to emphasize what I said before that so far as Christ was concerned as a prophet from God that He was sent by God, authorized by Him, and sent direct from the Throne of God. That He was the last prophet that God sent but that after His resurrection God recognized the authority of Christ to call these men who were to take charge of His Church. That He recognized their authority because He had given unto Christ all power in Heaven and on earth. Before the coming of Christ, all religious business on the earth was transacted in the name of God, and after His coming all such business was transacted in the name of the Savior. Under former dispensations, all business up to the advent of Christ into this world was transacted in the name of the Father; none of it in the name of the Son. But after Christ arose from the dead and ascended to His place on High at the right hand of the Father and as long as this dispensation lasts, all such business is to be transacted in the name of Christ. I lay it down here as a proposition that cannot be set aside that all religious business is transacted in this way. Now we want Brother Rich to show that religious business in this day is transacted in some other name than Christ's, but here is work that he cannot do because the authority of Christ is to remain in the world until the last enemy is put beneath His foot. Thus it behooved Christ to suffer that repentance and remission of sin might be preached in His name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.

SECOND NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

PRESIDENT BEN. E. RICH.

I am very glad that I have Brother Bunner joking at last, and I think the best joke of all is that he has run out of Biblical powder before the second night of this debate is over. The question at issue is about prophets not being called of God after the coming of Jesus Christ. It was a Biblical question, and he has demonstrated to you beyond the question of a doubt that he is whipped, that he has run out of powder, that he cannot stick to the subject but wants to leave it and talk about the Mormons and Joseph Smith and so on, etc. You have heard the proposition read repeatedly, and you know that none of these questions enter in this discussion. Now, Brother Bunner, why don't you stand up like a man and acknowledge that you are licked and that you cannot stick to the Bible; and quit trying to crawfish and bring in matters that are foreign to the subject under discussion. No matter how much he wants me to leave this subject, I am not yet ready to do so. There is not an individual in this meeting tonight that shall go away without being compelled to say, if they speak the truth, that I am still standing upon the resolution:

"RESOLVED, That John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets called of God." This is the proposition that I am here to deny, but before we are through with this discussion I shall allow these other matters which Brother Bunner insists on forcing into this debate to enter, and then I will jump on you, Brother Bunner, with both feet. I do not propose for a moment to have him frighten me away from the question at issue. He is through with the Bible, he has no more argument of any kind to present and must resort to these other issues that are away from the question in order to fill in his time. He wants to know what I would say if a person should come to me and

ask me what to do to be saved, whether I would refer him to the Scriptures as we have them written, or whether I would give him a new way. I will tell you plainly what I would say to him. I would turn to the Acts of the Apostles to the second chapter, and I would show him that the same question was asked of the apostles upon the Day of Pentecost. I could read to him beginning with the 38th verse what was said by Peter, the chief of the apostles, in answer to that question. Peter saw that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ was springing up in their hearts, and he intended that they should follow that faith with repentance, that they should follow repentance with baptism, for the remission of sins, and that they should follow such baptism by the laying on of hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Peter not only intended that they should follow this plan, but he instructed them definitely upon this subject, and he made plain to them a point which has not come to the understanding of Brother Bunner, namely, that baptism is for the remission of sins, not an outward ordinance typifying an inward grace. In answer, then, to Brother Bunner's question, let me say that I would tell the inquirer just what I have read here, and I would tell him that if he would do as he is here instructed to do he would receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. If then he were to ask me how he should receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost, I should turn him still further along to the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Here we follow Peter a little further when he was on his road to Samaria to administer the ordinance of laying on of hands to people who had been baptized by duly authorized servants of God, but who had not yet received the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Peter went there on the special mission of giving these believers, who had been baptized, and who had conformed in every particular to the instructions which they had received from the apostles of Christ, the Gift of the Holy Ghost through the laying on of hands. While I should use these Scriptures in answering the question which has been put to me, I would go farther into their proper interpretation than Brother Bunner would go, by showing what kind of authority it is necessary for one to have in order to officiate in the ordinances of the Gospel of Christ. I would show that he must be called

by divine authority through a prophet of God, in order to have proper authority to baptize and lay on hands, etc. If you will come and ask Brother Bunner what to do to be saved, I do not believe he will tell you that baptism is for the remission of sins, or that the Holy Ghost is given by the laying on of hands, or that authority such as was held by Peter is necessary in this day. Yet this man Peter, who had had bestowed upon him the keys of the Kingdom, had given this definite instruction, and when he answered this question upon the Day of Pentecost, he impressed upon the minds of all those who heard him that this was the Eternal answer that must be given throughout all the ages. The Scriptures teach that these ordinances must be administered by one who had been called of God by prophecy and who had received these gifts through the laying on of hands, in order to administer them. If what I have said on this subject does not convince Brother Bunner that I am right in this interpretation of Scripture, I will ask him to read the words of Peter, which says:

> "For this promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

This promise then that the gifts of the spirit should follow compliance with the requirements laid down herein was very far-reaching, for the Scriptures say, this promise is unto you, unto your children, taking in another generation; unto those who are afar off, taking in the whole world; even as many as the Lord our God shall call. That answer then was to be to all the children of God who would ever ask, "what shall we do to be saved," the same Gospel, the same power, the same influence was to be used throughout all time, but it was to be coupled with divine authority. I would tell the individual further, that no person accepting the invitation to investigate the Gospel, in a proper spirit, with a mind free from prejudice and a heart open to receive instructions from the spirit of our Father, should ever go away with doubt in his heart as to the Gospel being the same today and forever. I would tell him further, that there is no individual upon the face of the earth having the right and authority to preach the Gospel, who would answer in any other way, because God

recognized these apostles to whom He had given the testimony of His Son and gave them the truth to give to the people. To a person then who had the right kind of faith in the Jesus who lived among men, who was crucified by men, who was resurrected, and lived for a season in their presence, to such a believer I would give these instructions for salvation. I should insist, however, that a faith in a bodiless Jesus, such as men teach, would not avail any more than a belief in a pagan god. When I speak of the spirit of prophecy being the testimony of Jesus, I do not mean a belief in that kind of a God with no body, no parts and who is simply nothing, but it must be a belief in that Jesus who came back among men after His resurrection, who tarried with His disciples, who ate with them and drank with them, and lived with them for forty days instructing them in the ways of everlasting life. When this same Jesus took His final adieu from them, the angel of God was there with the disciples who stood, gazing upward at Jesus, who was received into a cloud. He was going to His Heavenly home to sit on the right hand of the Father, but this angel declared that this personage who was seen thus ascending to Heaven, in like manner would reappear and would again move among men as during His forty days of sojourn with them as a living, vital personage. It is on such a Jesus that men must believe in order that the testimony of Jesus will be the spirit of prophecy. When He comes back to the earth He will come with a body and with mind and passions: He will have power to eat; power to teach; power to reign upon the earth. A belief in that kind of Jesus constitutes the spirit of prophecy. Brother Bunner does not say anything about this work being builded upon revelation because he ridicules the idea of revelation, but I want to tell you that a belief in a dead prophet never did and never will save a man if he rejects the living prophets. The devil and all his angels, in all dispensations, have been working to the end that they might fill the hearts of mankind with prejudice against every living prophet that God sent to mankind. Satan has always been willing that men should have faith in the prophets of previous ages, and he is willing that men should teach that such a faith is sufficient to salvation. But if Mr. Bunner will read the Scriptures

aright, he will find that the Church of Christ was built upon the foundation of prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone and that revelation from God is the governing principle of the Church. I challenge Brother Bunner to prove from a single Scriptural quotation that revelation from God was ever to cease. There is no Scripture which will show that the work of Christ has been built upon any other foundation than that of revelation from God Almighty. He may bluster and dare and he can dare and bluster, but he cannot get away from this principle of true religion. I know what he is saying to himself. He is saying, "For God's sake, Mr. Rich, help us out of this dilemma and introduce the Mormon question into this discussion. I have no more arguments on the subject of this proposition, but I have plenty of material for the vilifying of Joseph Smith to the last throughout the rest of this discussion," but, my friends, I am still standing firmly upon this proposition, and I want to show you now that this rock of revelation was the foundation stone of the Gospel of Christ. When Jesus Christ said to Apostle Peter "Whom do men say that I am?" Peter told Him the different prophets that the people claimed He was, and Christ turning to Peter, said, "And whom sayest thou that I am?" Peter answered, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God." Then came these words from the Savior:

> "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Now we have here two propositions, and Brother Bunner cannot get away from them. Jesus upon this occasion meant one of two things, either that He would build His Church upon the power that revealed this Eternal truth to Peter that Jesus was the Christ, which truth was imparted unto Peter by revelation: not something that was said by dead prophets but by living revelation; or, as our Catholic friends say, upon Peter himself. Now I want to tell you, Brother Bunner, that if you don't believe in revelation from God Almighty for the direction of His children, then you have no business to remain fifteen minutes outside of the

Catholic Church. One of two things is true, either Catholicism is true or a belief is necessary that God always reveals His mind and will to His servants, the prophets, and that prophets are necessary in all generations. Now I do not want you to feel that I have been ridiculing the work done in the great days of the Reformation, because I am not. I believe that the men of that period were inspired of God to do the work that they did. I believe that Charles Wesley was inspired to write many of his hymns, and it was on account of the inspiration of his brother John that he wrote them; his brother's influence inspired him to write that beautiful hymn concerning the cleansing blood of the Lamb:

"Ye different sects who all declare,
Lo here is Christ or Christ is there,
Your stranger proof divinely give,
And show me where true Christians live."

I believe that other great men of this period were divinely inspired, and that the work of the Reformation has a definite place in the purposes of God. But Brother Bunner has constantly ridiculed the idea of inspiration and the idea of revelation, though this is entirely contrary to the Gospel of the Bible as taught by Christ and His apostles. Without prophets (and my brother may ridicule them as much as he pleases), I have shown you that the people perish; perish for the word of God, I have also shown you that in all ages when God has had prophets upon the earth He has recognized their authority. It was so in the organization of our church, and while I know Brother Bunner will smile at this remark, I want to remind you again that I know my side of this question much better than Brother Bunner does, and that when I get ready to fire blunderbuss he will find it is loaded clear up to the brim. But I am going to stick to the question at issue until I have disposed of this part of my subject and convinced my hearers of the need of modern revelation in the church. There is another occasion upon which God recognized this authority of His chosen apostles and His authorized agents, and it has been referred to by my friend. It is the case of Cornelius, that great and devout man, full of good works, who loved to give alms to the poor. He was so righteous that when he

prayed to the Father his prayers ascended to His Throne. Oh, if Brother Bunner were to meet such a man as Cornelius he would say unto him, "You are saved, there is nothing more for you to do." But how different it was when Cornelius received his instruction by an angel through the spirit of revelation. Judging Cornelius by Brother Bunner's faith, we would say that there was nothing else for Cornelius to do, that his prayer had reached the Throne of God, and that he was already in favor. Cornelius was praying to know what he should do to be saved, and God sent His angel to tell him what to do. Did he give him full instructions? No, this is not the plan upon which God operates. He had prophets upon the earth, placed there in order that the people should not perish for hearing the word of God, and the angel told him where to find a prophet who would tell him words whereby he could be saved. This instance is recorded in the New Testament, and it verifies the prophecy which I quoted you from the Old, "Surely God will do nothing but He revealeth His secret unto His servants, the prophets." Brother Bunner has told you that this prophecy was to apply only to the prophets of the Old Testament, and yet the angel who came to instruct Cornelius understood the law and that this prophecy from the Old Testament must have its fulfillment also in the New. I want to remind you of the words of Jesus when He said,

"I came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them."

The angel who came to Cornelius told him where he would find a prophet of God; an authorized agent, and Cornelius sent his servants to that man. The angel even told him the occupation of the man in whose home this apostle was living, and he said unto Cornelius, "This prophet will tell you words whereby ye might be saved." Peter had been instructed by the Savior to go to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, and not to the Gentiles, and it was necessary, therefore, in order that Cornelius should receive proper instruction that Peter should receive a revelation from God showing him that the time had come when the Gospel should be carried to the Gentiles, not only, then, did God recognize the authority of the apostle in sending Cornelius to him, but He recognized the need of revelation to Peter in

order that His servant, Cornelius, should be properly instructed in the way of life and salvation. God knew the character of Peter, and He knew that conversion would be necessary before he would carry the Gospel to the Gentiles. But He also knew that Peter perfectly understood that the Gospel which he was teaching to the world was based upon the foundation of modern revelation and that Peter would understand God. Therefore He gave Peter that magnificent vision which taught him the lesson that what God hath cleansed no man may call unclean. Peter knew that the apostles at Jerusalem would call him to account for administering the ordinance of baptism to a Gentile, and he, therefore, took witnesses with him when he went to the home of Cornelius, and there God poured out additional evidence before the eyes of these witnesses, and the gifts of the Spirit were made manifest as upon the Day of Pentecost. After this great manifestation of the power of God, Peter, still mindful of the fact that he would be called into question by the apostles at Jerusalem for administering baptism to Cornelius and his house, said unto those assembled,

> "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

You will remember that Peter's actions were called in question by his brothers at Jerusalem, and he was under the necessity of explaining to them that the doors of the Gospel were opened to the Gentile nations through a revelation from God.

Now Brother Bunner challenged me to show that the vineyard was taken from Israel and given to another people and I have accepted and answered that challenge. From this time forward the Gospel gradually drifted away from the Jews to the Gentiles, but in all cases God recognized the authority of His prophets though they were men who came after Jesus. Brother Bunner will acknowledge that the Apostle Paul was called by revelation to the ministry after the crucifixion of Christ and that he became the great apostle to the Gentiles and that he was set apart by the laying on of hands by the other apostles. Now if no apostle was so authorized and set apart then Paul did

not have such authority because he was not in the Church of Christ at the time Christ was taken from the earth. Now, Brother Bunner, if you possibly can, without exploding, just keep a little of this Mormonism to yourself until you get through with the Bible, and give us evidence from this Bible that prophets shall not be necessary, and just when their mission was to cease. This is what we want you to do, and this is what you cannot do, and I predict that you will not talk fifteen minutes tomorrow night upon the subject in question without getting off upon Mormonism. It is not the first time that I have seen an individual crazy over the Mormon question. Now, my friends, I hope you will all come tomorrow night and hear us, and I hope that God will bless us that truth may prevail and error may be confounded, and that God may recognize his servant; this is my prayer in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THIRD NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

I am very glad to appear before you again tonight. As the time is drawing short, I shall pass at once to the subject under discussion, for I want to use all the time I have in the investigation of this subject. Brother Rich stated last night that he was going to jump on me with both feet. Well, if he does he will be like the man with one eye, one arm, and one leg. He will go back to New York with his theological constitution not darn near but altogether ruined. Mr. Rich stated last night that he was not satisfied with my manner of investigating the proposition. Before this discussion began, I was satisfied that my manner of debating would not suit him. I want to say, however, with reference to the proposition that when he says that I have left the proposition entirely and that I am arguing a subject which should not enter, he forgets our agreement when we met to discuss this subject. I asked him at that time to affirm a proposition concerning Mormonism, and he said that we did not want two propositions covering the same ground; that this proposition which we are arguing would cover the entire ground of difference between us and, therefore, also the work done by Joseph Smith on earth. I wanted him also to affirm that the ministers of the Mormon Church were the only ministers upon the earth who are authorized of God and that they were the only ones who had a right to preach and administer in the ordinances of the Gospel. This he would not do, but insisted that the proposition which we are arguing covered the entire subject. Of course I agreed with him because the question I was anxious to get at in the investigation was just this question of Mormonism. Now with reference to the subject of our proposition as it is stated, that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent by God, let me insist that I have thoroughly

established that proposition, established it beyond the question of a doubt. I established it by quoting to you the Holy Scriptures, and asked Mr. Rich to show that any prophet entered the world after the "last of all" quoted in my opening speech. He has not offered a reply that is in any sense satisfactory. His attempt to reply was a signal failure because I presented an argument which could not be answered. This Scripture caps the climax of this investigation and proves the proposition, as stated before, to you, beyond a question of a doubt.

Well then this being true, of course, I am desirous of investigating the claims of my friend that there are prophets among his people who were sent of God and that one of these prophets of the later generation was Joseph Smith, Jr. Naturally then Joseph Smith comes up for investigation. We want him to establish this proposition that Joseph Smith was a prophet sent by God. I assail this statement, and propose to prove here that he was not a prophet sent by God. I want, however, to state this with reference to Christ. Mr. Rich quoted to us last evening a prophecy of Moses that a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up in the last day, and apply this Scripture to Joseph Smith. We propose to see wherein this Scripture does apply to Joseph Smith. Now if it does he was a prophet like unto Moses, a law giver, not merely a foreteller of future events. "A prophet shall your Father raise up like unto me," said Moses, and Mr. Rich asserts that Joseph Smith was this prophet. Joseph Smith then should be a law giver, not only a law giver, but a mediator of the covenant, he should be the leader of a nation composed of God's peculiar people. Now in this sense Jesus Christ was a prophet like unto Moses, who was a law giver. He was a leader of that nation, Israel, known as God's peculiar people. He was not only a law giver, but a mediator of the new covenant. Now Joseph Smith was not a mediator of a covenant, and he was not a law giver. He was, therefore, not a prophet like unto Moses, and if this is true he cannot be looked upon as the prophet spoken of by Moses. Now if Joseph Smith is such a prophet of God, then we want to join with our friends and become one people with them, don't you see, so that we want him to establish this proposition which he

would not even affirm. The apostles whom Christ left upon the earth derived their commissions from the Lord Jesus Christ. Well, then, this being true, if Jesus Christ is a prophet in the sense in which Moses was a prophet, He must receive His commission as a law giver, as the leader of a peculiar people, and as a mediator of a new covenant. But Joseph Smith was not such a prophet, and my friend has not shown us a single proof of authority to preach the Gospel and administer in its ordinances. He did not receive this authority from the Lord Jesus Christ for he was not one of his apostles, and, of course, had no authority to do these things. Mr. Rich's entire authority comes from Joseph Smith, Jr., don't you see? This is what we want to impress upon your minds because he claims that his authority came from Jesus Christ. Of course we are inspired, says Mr. Rich, because we are apostles sent of God. Paul was such an apostle and he was inspired, and these Mormon ministers claim that they are inspired because the Apostle Paul was inspired. When Paul declared that he was an apostle of Jesus Christ, he showed the signs of his apostleship right among the people, but in all the years since the Mormon church was organized, they have not been able to show a single, solitary sign such as was shown by the apostles of Christ in order to prove their position. Now we know what these signs are, and we expect Mr. Rich to be able to show them, to be able to administer in his doctrine, or it will prove that his commission was not from God. We do not deny that Christ and His apostles received the Holy Spirit without measure, but we do deny that Joseph Smith and his apostles received it. Mr. Rich claims that the apostles of Jesus Christ had successors in their offices. Suppose he were able to establish this position which he is not, this would not establish the fact that the apostles of Joseph Smith's choosing were so commissioned, and if he attempts to establish that they were commissioned of God, he must establish it upon the Scriptures of Eternal truth. A mere statement that these Mormon apostles are the successors of Jesus Christ will not succeed in convincing this audience. Now, Friend Rich, come right up to this work like a man and give us your arguments to sustain the position which you occupy. These people cannot even find out by the course

you are pursuing what you believe, and yet that should come under this investigation. We have shown that the Holy Spirit as made manifest in the days of the apostles was received in two ways, by baptism and by the laying on of hands. These two manifestations of the spirit were different. The one we shall call, for the want of a better name, the wonder-working spirit of God or the spirit of God in its wonder-working power; this spirit we find manifested as recorded in the 8th chapter of the Roman Letter. Here we see that every Christian, every disciple of Christ who had received the ordinance of baptism, had received the spirit. There were some, however, who were admitted into the church by the spirit of adoption into the family of God, and this spirit of adoption was never received by the laying on of hands. This is the spirit referred to in the Acts of the Apostles in the 8th chapter and the 38th verse, that is, the spirit of adoption. This is the spirit that was received on the condition that men would repent of their sins and be baptized, not the spirit that was conferred by the laying on of hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Not a single, solitary word is said about having to receive this spirit of adoption by the laying on of hands. The wonder-working spirit, however, the power of working miracles, this was received by baptism and by the laying on of hands. Mormons teach that the spirit is received in this way today, by baptism followed by the laying on of hands. Not every person, therefore, who was admitted into the church was given this wonder-working power that made it possible for them to speak in new tongues, and do many other wonderful works. This power was received only by the laying on of hands and only in a limited number of cases. It was received first by baptism and next by the laying on of hands as on the Day of Pentecost and at the household of Cornelius. The Lord has said that "In the last days I will pour out my spirit upon all the face of the earth," and upon this Scripture my Mormon friends depend to substantiate their claims.

I want to inquire again into the way into which the Priesthood was received by Smith and Cowdery. They claimed that they got this Priesthood from John the Baptist and that after this they were instructed to lay hands

upon each other for the receiving of the Priesthood. Now what I want to know is was the work of the angel a failure that it had to be done over by these men? If the work of the angel was a failure, and, therefore, had to be done over, I want to know how you are going to establish that the work that was done by them was not a failure also. Now the work of the Aaronic Priesthood was done away in Christ, and I want to know what its purpose is in the church today; if it was conferred upon them, what was it for? I want to ask further if when these men received the Holy Spirit (and they claim they did receive it), they spoke in new tongues as the spirit gave them utterance, and if these manifestations were seen by the multitude or shown only in secret. When these manifestations were given at the house of Cornelius and upon the Day of Pentecost in the City of Jerusalem, they were not given in secret nor withheld from unbelievers. If the Holy Ghost sits upon these men today and they can speak in all the language of the earth, why do they not do it before this audience. That is what the apostles did, and I defy any Mormon from their head prophet that sits upon his Throne in Salt Lake City, to the lowest in their ranks, to speak in a language that they have never learned. Let us now come to the account of the conversion in Samaria. We read in the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that

> "When the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost for as yet he was fallen upon none of them."

Philip was an Evangelist, and he went down to Samaria and preached the Gospel of Christ to the Samaritans. What was the result? Why, the result was that the Samaritans did believe the words of Philip and did receive baptism; they also received this wonder-working power of the spirit of God. This power was never given to any set of men in the days of the apostles only by the laying on of hands by the apostles. The people who were received into the church by the spirit of adoption did not receive this wonder-working power of the spirit which enabled them to speak with tongues, but this spirit was necessary on some occasions

for the confirmation of the belief of some of the people, and was given for the strengthening of faith in the Gospel of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. What was the result when Simon stood by and saw the Saints receive the spirit? Why, he saw that by the laying on of hands of the apostles the Holy Spirit was given in such a way as to be made outwardly manifest, and he desired to purchase it for money. What did Peter say? He said in substance, "Your heart is not right in the sight of God, repent therefore of this wickedness, for the spirit of God is not given for money." Peter told him that he had no part or lot in this matter of receiving the wonder-working spirit. This was the work of an apostle of Jesus Christ, and when these apostles laid their hands upon those who had been converted, those who stood by saw and heard something and when Simon saw that by the laying on of hands the Holy Spirit was given, why, naturally, he wanted this power. He saw something with his eyes; he heard them speak with new tongues and prophesy. Now I take the position here, and I want you to understand that position, that if these men who profess to have that power in these days cannot show hat same manifestation, then they do not have that power. We want them to give us proof of the claims and if they produce no evidence at all whatsoever, we must conclude they are not able to speak with tongues which they have not learned. I have traveled thirty-eight years over this country, and I have never seen a man who could speak in tongues that he did not know. I have looked for these manifestations of their power and have failed to find them. Now to show you that these powers were to be withdrawn from the world, I refer you to this prophecy.

> "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease, whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away."

Why was this prophecy to be fulfilled? Because when certainty came with Jesus Christ, men were justified by knowledge, not by faith, therefore knowledge received directly from God, knowledge by direct communication of the Holy Spirit, was not necessary. Men do not receive knowledge any more in that way. If there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. Now we see in part and the same prophecy

tells us that, tongue shall cease; and I defy any Latter Day Saint to get up before this audience and speak in a tongue he has never learned. He cannot do it. Paul says these things shall vanish away. Now we see in part, and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect shall come, then that which is in part shall be done away with. What does that mean? Why, it means the perfect system of salvation of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is that that is perfect, that was to come, and when it came this knowledge which was given in part was done away with. The Gospel after Jesus Christ is a perfect system of salvation. That meets the sinner in his sins, and takes him out of his sins and lands him into salvation if he continues faithfully. When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away with. While John was upon the Isle of Patmos he said that the cannon of Scripture was closed, and from that day to this the silence of Heaven has never been broken. We see these things have ceased. Paul said they would cease, and it is up to my friend to show that they have not ceased. I want you to remember that the apostles exercised their gifts in the daylight not in the darkness; that they did them in the presence of multitudes, not in the corners; and my friends must show us those same manifestations in public places to convince us that they hold this power. This is the only way that my friend can get around these things, and if my friend is to establish his position here tonight, he must do it with more than words.

All these different factions of Mormonism claim to be able to do these things but when it comes to doing the work they are all failures. I say this of every one of them. They do not work miracles. I am willing to go on to every case, and I will show that in every case where this comes up for investigation that there were things seen and heard and that this constituted the evidence that the apostles possessed that power. We cannot find a single, solitary evidence of this kind in the whole of Mormondom. They are the most deluded people on the earth today. The Seventh Day Adventists and Mohammedans both claim to have prophets. They make just as high a claim as Joseph Smith to revelation, but these people are not so deluded as the Mormons.

We are not going to take the word of every individual that comes along claiming to be an apostle of Jesus Christ. I want now to investigate for a moment some of the things taught by the Mormons in their articles of faith. Notice this article:

> "We believe that the first principles and ordinances of the Gospel are first, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, Second, repentance through baptism by immersion."

Notice that baptism by immersion. Why don't you say baptism by baptism or immersion by immersion; it would mean the same thing. Some time ago somebody asked me if I was baptized by immersion, and I told him no, that I was baptized by Brother John Henderson. (Laughter.) The Mormons are trying to make the word of God plainer, and in their attempt to explain it they make it so no one can understand it. So in their statement baptism by immersion they attempt to make it appear that it amounts to something different, but baptism by immersion means baptism. Now in this article of faith they claim that they have the power to confer the Holy Ghost, and I have shown you that they never yet have conferred that power, and that this article of their faith is untrue. Paul said during his personal ministry that there are some who preach the Gospel for love and some for profit, and I rejoice that Christ has preached the perfect Gospel and that He has taught the way in the new testament Scripture. It all goes to show that you can kill a bird with a crooked stick as well as a straight one, if you can hit it.

THIRD NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

President Ben. E. Rich.

I am glad to know that I have succeeded in getting Brother Bunner to joke with his audience. You know how disgusted he was with me the first night of this debate, and how he told you that I was trying to bulldose him by telling stories. Now if he keeps on telling stories he will be a pretty good story-teller before the debate is finished. A person told me the other day he attended a revival meeting conducted by Brother Bunner recently; that after the meeting Brother Bunner saw a young man from the country standing gazing around, with a vacant stare and thinking he had made an impression upon him, during the meeting, and he went up to him and said, "Son, are you looking for salvation?" "No, hang it all," said the fellow, "I am looking for Sal Johnson." I believe that is the kind of an impression Brother Bunner will make upon this audience, and that those of you whom he thinks are looking for salvation from his arguments will really be looking for something else, so far as his plan for accomplishing that desirable result is concerned. I am also glad I made another impression upon him last night, you will remember he went to the Bible very, very little, the night previous, indeed scarcely at all, and I asked him why he did not. I plead with him to turn back to the Bible and discuss the question at issue or to acknowledge like a man that he was licked. He stands up to the Bible a little better tonight, but he does not stand up altogether yet. Even with the last charge that he fired from his blunderbuss, he will not at this stage of the game prevent me from sticking to my subject. I am still debating the question,

"RESOLVED, that John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets sent of God, and that the Bible, as given to us by Christ and the apostles in Palestine is a sufficient

guide to salvation from sin." He says that I have not answered any of his arguments, that I made an attempt last night to answer his famous "last of all" and that I utterly failed in meeting the argument. Now it may be impossible for me to get down deep enough beneath his scalp to make him understand some things. One must be hard of understanding to call his foolish interpretation of the Scripture an argument, but if I must renounce all hope of making him understand the Scriptures, I may still feel that this audience will know that what I said last night is verily true, and that it cannot be successfully controverted.

When Jesus spoke that parable about the vineyard, he was speaking to the House of Israel, and this House of Israel was the keeper of the vineyard of the Lord. From that race of people sprang the prophets who preceded Christ, and these prophets had been instructed to work among their own people, to work for Israel; for to them the prophets were sent. God sent these servants time after time to the House of Israel, and as often as they were sent they met with violence. But before God would desert this people He determined to send His Son, hoping that Israel might be turned from the error of her ways and be brought back into the paths that had been mapped out for her to follow. "Last of all," mark it Brother Bunner, "last of all," try and concentrate your intellect upon it Brother Bunner, just try hard, I will pray for you, "last of all," *He sent His Son to them*, and they meted out to that Son the treatment they had meted out to the others. I pointed out the words where the Chief Priests the Ministers, if you please, in the House of Israel acknowledged they knew He referred to them, in this parable, yes to the House of Israel, Brother Bunner. I showed you that after Christ had been crucified and had been rejected of these evil husbandmen that God decreed that His revelations and His prophets should be taken from them and go among the Gentiles. I do not know whether Brother Bunner will live long enough to understand that or not. Perhaps he will never understand this proper interpretation of Scripture any better than he does the rest, or than you understand other disconnected Scriptures he has tried to interpret for you and which were so plain and easy to interpret, until he placed his own false

interpretations upon them. I now call your attention to a few things that have been gone over. I am going over them carefully in order that we may look at them point by point; see their bearing upon the question at issue, and draw proper conclusions from them. Let me call your attention again to the prophecy of Amos and ask you to keep it in mind as one of the fundametal arguments which I have established and which Brother Bunner has not attempted to explain. Before going into this argument further, I want to say that Brother Bunner in his first night's discourse placed words in the mouth of Christ that He did not utter. He misrepresented God Almighty concerning the transfiguration on the mount; he misrepresented the apostles who were present with Christ at the time of this transfiguration. He did not produce one line of Scripture or one reference from any source to substantiate his own positive statement that the apostles put Moses and Elias on an equal footing with Christ, nor did he produce one iota of proof for his assertion that God came upon that particular occasion to reprove the apostles for placing these prophets of a former period on an equality with Christ. He made the assertion that God ignored these prophets of the earlier period, and that in the recognition of His Son He meant to reprove the apostles for assuming that Moses and Elias were on an equality with Christ. I want Brother Bunner now to show us some evidence, if he can find it anywhere in Holy Scripture, to substantiate this foolish interpretation which he had placed upon this Scripture. The apostles who were with Christ on that occasion had no thought of equality or inequality so far as we can interpret this Holy record, but they recognized these prophets of a former period as servants of God, and knowing Christ to be the Son of God, they recognized them as fellow workers for the salvation of the souls of men. You may read the Bible every day of your life in search of something to substantiate his foolish interpretation, and you will never find it. I am satisfied that Brother Bunner would never have brought such an argument before an audience that he felt was not altogether in sympathy with him. He feels that upon this occasion he is speaking against a church that is unpopular and therefore thinks he may use any kind of foolishness he pleases and call it argument. I understand

fully the position that I occupy. I do not belong to a popular church, but my Church is just as popular as the early Christian Church was in the days of Christ and the apostles, among the people with whom they associated. Down south one time they were dedicating a Baptist Church and a visiting minister had been invited in to speak to the congregation. The Deacon of the church came up to him and told him not to say anything about intemperance because they had a number of people present who were interested financially in the liquor business and that they were among their best contributors. The visiting minister readily agreed. In a moment the deacon came back to him again and said, "Some of our worthy Presbyterian friends have just entered, and it would be unwise to say anything against the Presbyterian Church. Again before the meeting opened, the Deacon came to him and told him some of the Methodists had just entered the church and that while they needed reproving and turning from the error of their ways that the particular members present were very friendly to the Baptist Church and he did hope he would cultivate their friendship by speaking nicely and saying nothing about baptism by immersion. The minister, somewhat exasperated, asked him, "What in the world can I talk about," and the Deacon said, "Why, talk about the Mormons, they haven't a friend in the community." It has always been popular, my friends, among certain classes of people, and among certain narrow contracted ministers to talk about the Mormon people, but even that should not induce my friend to leave the question at issue and devote his whole attention to slandering my Church nor do I believe that it justifies him in misquoting me. He told you that I quoted Scripture about a prophet being raised up who was to be like unto Moses, and that I said Joseph Smith was that prophet. Now my friends, that is not the truth. I did not say that Joseph Smith was that prophet. He is putting words into my mouth which I did not utter. I want now to call your attention to another passage of Scripture that has a direct bearing upon the question we are discussing. It is these words of Peter:

> "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."

I should like to rivet these words upon your hearts in

order that their full meaning might appear to you and that you would never forget them. "If any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth in order that God may be glorified through Jesus Christ to whom be praise, honor and glory given." The Apostle Peter had received his instruction for the ministry from the lips of Jesus Christ; he knew the meaning of what he said and how necessary it was that if any man should speak to the people he should speak as an oracle of God. Brother Bunner told you that he had not been called by proper authority, and that he had taken it upon himself to minister in the name of Jesus Christ. How then can he speak as an oracle of God? From the Scripture I have quoted to you, you see he does not even have a testimony of Jesus Christ for he denies the spirit of prophecy, and we are told that this testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. If he does not have that testimony, then how can he minister for Christ? He ridicules the very foundation upon which this Scripture is based, namely, the foundation of revelation, and the spirit of prophecy. How then can he be an oracle of God? I want you to think over these things and ask yourselves soberly and candidly this question, Can any man who has not the testimony of Jesus Christ, so administer the affairs of His Kingdom to men upon the earth? I am going to quote you now the words of the Apostle Paul to the Romans:

> "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!"

Now, my friends, do you suppose for one moment that God will ever send a minister for Christ who will deny the necessity of being called by revelation from God? Do you suppose that a man who takes upon himself the authority to speak in the name of God and who denies that the inspiration of the Spirit of God is necessary for a proper ministry can ever be recognized by God as a truly appointed agent? Do you think God will ever call a man to stand before a congregation and declare to the people that the windows of

Heaven have been closed, that the Heavens are as brass above our heads, and that the voice of God has not spoken to a single man through the countless days and years that have passed since Christ left the earth? According to Brother Bunner, nineteen hundred years have passed since any communication from the Throne of God has come to men upon the earth, yet the law was that God should instruct His people always through revelation; that that spirit which revealed unto Peter that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, was to be the foundation upon which the Church was to be reared. All through the old and new testament history we find the evidence of that spirit of revelation and of the ministry of the apostles of God to the people. Jacob saw the ladder which was used by the messenger of communication between God and man, its foot resting upon the earth and its summit in the clouds; and from that day forward the spirit of revelation guided the children of Israel. Brother Bunner agrees that it was necessary all through their history for the people of the old testament to receive communication from the Father, but argues that such communication has been done away. He agrees that it was necessary for men to be properly called in order to officiate in the name of the Father in old testament times, but he claims that this is no longer necessary. Paul says in the Hebrew Letter that I quoted:

> "And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron."

I want you to read the manner in which Aaron was called of God. If you will read the 4th chapter of Exodus, you will find he was called by the power of revelation. You will discover that there was a prophet standing upon the earth; you will find that God Almighty through that prophet called Aaron unto the ministry. That was an age of revelation, and no man denying that God reveals His will to men or the possibility of prophets living upon the earth since the days of Christ can be called of God as was Aaron. I would like you also to read the 28th chapter of Exodus, and you will discover that God not only called Aaron in this way but that He likewise called his sons into the ministry, and in making this call He used His authorized agents because the Lord God "doeth nothing save He revealeth His mind and will to

His servants, the prophets." In reading these two chapters, there is but one conclusion to be drawn, and that is, in order for a man to minister for Christ he must be called of God by revelation given through a properly authorized prophet of God. My Brother tries to make it appear that these prophecies belong only to the old testament, but I have quoted to you from the 8th chapter of the Hebrew Letter, showing that the Apostle Paul recognized that this same plan was to govern in the Christian Church, and that no man must minister except one who was called of God as was Aaron. If you wish additional evidence on this subject of the manner in which prophets were called, let me ask you to read Numbers 27th chapter, 18th verse, also the 34th chapter and 9th verse of Deuteronomy, the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, likewise the 13th chapter, and in all of these passages you will discover that God's properly constituted authority among men was conferred only in the way that I have designated. I have also read to you the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and the 34th chapter of Ephesians, in order to point out to you the fact that apostles and prophets were needed among the people of the new testament and to show that prophets were among the officers who constituted the government of the Church of Christ. I have shown you that the Church of Christ was likened unto a perfect body of a perfect man, and that this organization rested upon the foundation of revelation from God, that these authorities in His Church were called of God and that so long as God had a church upon the earth which He recognized that these officers were to remain in that Church "for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ until we all come to a unity of the faith." If Christ's Church ever departed from the earth it was because of the wickedness of men; the spirit of the apostasy sprang up in their hearts; they loved darkness rather than light; they turned away from the teachings of the prophets of God; put the prophets to death, and departed entirely from the faith. They denied the need for apostles and prophets in the Church though they had been distinctly told that without these officers the Church of Jesus Christ could not exist and that her children would be tossed to and fro and be carried about by every wind of doctrine, as men-

tioned in the 4th chapter of Ephesians, the 14th verse. There is no guide to salvation from sin unless there be a person endowed with authority to act in administering the ordinance of salvation to the people. How repeatedly have I called your attention to that prophecy that where there are no prophets the people perish for want of someone to teach them the work of God? How often have I insisted upon that Scripture which tells us that the Lord God uses prophets as His agents and that He has no others! Now, my friends, I want to leave it to you to say whether I have stuck to the subject under discussion, and whether I am right or wrong in refusing to be led away from the subject, notwithstanding the attacks which Brother Bunner has made upon my Church, and notwithstanding his false interpretation of our teaching. He has evidently lost all his power to show from the Bible that the foolish interpretations he has been trying to place upon the Scriptures can be justified. It is not strange that he should lose this power to use the Scriptures, if he ever had it, for he denies the need of inspiration. When my opponent declares that God has not spoken to any man upon the earth since He spoke to John upon the Isle of Patmos, and that there was to be no prophet upon the earth after Christ was taken away, it is no wonder he has no power to interpret Scripture. In the 12th chapter of the Book of Revelation the angel tells John that he must yet prophesy before many people, and John fulfilled this statement after he left the Isle of Patmos. It was after he had been released from the Isle of Patmos that he wrote his epistles, and his Gospel, and our modern Bible students who investigated this question without prejudice have all come to this conclusion. Yet, according to Mr. Bunner, the Heavens are brass, and no more communication can come from there; no voice of a prophet can be heard among men. Yet he accepts the Gospel of John as the word of God, and that came after he said that God Almighty would allow no one to add a word to that book. Oh, how foolish, how foolish! He draws this conclusion from the closing words of John in the Book of Revelation which I am surprised he has not quoted before. It is such an old story, and yet it has been entirely abandoned by the ministers of the present day. He wants to infer from these words of the Apostle John that

God is never again going to give a revelation to His children upon the earth. I want to say to you that when any minister does this it is with the desire in his heart to deceive his hearers because he knows that that statement referred to the Book of Revelation only, and which John said must not be changed because the truths found therein had been given him by revelation. If you will turn to the Book of Deuteronomy, you will find the same sort of warning there:

> "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you neither shall ye diminish ought from it that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."

There has never been a day, and there never will be a day, when God Almighty will not have the right and the power to speak to men upon the earth, and He will never tie Himself up to such an extent that He cannot speak. It is impossible for Brother Bunner to make God tonguetied. I want to call your attention now to this additional fact in connection with the Book of Revelation. When the compilers of the Bible, who had been selected by King James, all of them fearless, scholarly, God-fearing men, set about that task, they found the manuscripts from which it was to be written scattered all over the Orient. They gathered together all the inspired records they could find, and used them in bringing forth the King James translation of the Bible. There was some question arose then as to what books should be included in that record, and while this question had arisen many years before, it was by no means a settled question, and indeed it is today by no means a settled question. I am going to ask Brother Bunner the question, whether if something should turn up that would bring to us the lost Scriptures that are referred to in the Bible itself, if he would deny them a place in the Scriptures because of this statement in the Book of Revelation. If these other Scriptures were found, would he accept them? Here are a few books that have been referred to in the Bible. Some of them are referred to by the apostles as the word of God, and yet they cannot be found in the Bible. These manuscripts could not be found at the time the Bible was compiled, or perhaps some of them were rejected by those devout Jews who first passed upon the cannon of Scripture. I want to ask if they should

be found would Brother Bunner accept them as Scripture? There is a long list of such books mentioned all through the Scriptures. Moses speaks of the Book of the Covenant, Exodus 24th chapter, and of the Book of Ware, Numbers 21st chapter. What about the Book of Jasher spoken of in Joshua, 10th chapter, the writings of Samuel, 1st Samuel, 10th chapter, three thousand proverbs of Solomon; what about the Book of the Acts of Simon, 1st Kings, 11th chapter, the Book of Nathan and Gad, 1st Chronicles, 29th chapter, the prophecies of Ahaijah, and Visions of Iddo, 2nd Chronicles, 9th chapter; the Book of Shemaiah, 2nd Chronicles, 12th chapter, the Book of Jehu, 2nd Chronicles, 20th chapter, the Sayings of the Seer, 2nd Chronicles, 33rd chapter, one of the missing epistles of Paul spoken of in 1st Corinthians 5th chapter, of the Scripture which was preached to Abraham, Galatians 3rd chapter; of his epistle from Laodicea, Colossians 4th chapter; of a former epistle of Jude; of the prophecy of Enoch as spoken of by Jude; and numerous other Scriptures that could be mentioned. I wonder, Brother Bunner, what you would do with these Scriptures if they were to be found. Would you deny them a place in the Bible because of this statement found in the Book of Revelation? Many of these books are quoted by the apostles as the word of God both to former generations and to the Church in their day, and yet they cannot be found in the Bible because they could not be found when the Bible was compiled. I should like to ask Brother Bunner if he believes that the books of the New Testament are arranged in the order of their writing, or if they were placed in their present order by the compilers of this book without any reference to their dates? We are told by writers upon this subject that some of these books had a hard time to find their way into our Bible, and that the Book of Revelation was accepted by one majority vote only, and that for this reason it was placed as the last book of the Bible. I want now to spend the few moments left to me in answering some of the statements made by Brother Bunner in previous addresses. (Time.)

THIRD NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

I suppose my friend will try to make you think that all these books of which he has spoken are found in the Book of Mormon and in Joseph Smith's revelations. I am not prepared to argue this question just now, but I will gladly argue this proposition any other time, and I will have something more to say of them before this debate is closed. Now, suppose I were to admit all that he has said to you about these lost books; suppose that some of the books that are now in our Bible were lost; that would not prove that the book of Mormon is true, or that it was of divine origin. This would not prove that Joseph Smith's revelations would fill up the vacancy that was caused by the loss of these books. His argument reminds me of a little story I heard once about a little boy who went out to set a little blue hen. When he came into the house, his mother asked him if he had set the hen, and he said, Oh, yes, I set her all right, I put twenty-five eggs under her. His mother asked him why in the world he put so many eggs under the old blue hen, and he said, 'I wanted to see her spread herself.' Now Mr. Rich has just been trying to spread himself, and I want to see him spread himself some more upon the question that I have put to him to answer before this debate is over. I want to say, however, in regard to the lost books of the Bible that there were none of the inspired books lost, none that were necessary to make the record complete. As to the Book of Revelation being written before the Gospel of the Apostle John, that statement cannot be established. That book is said to have been written in 97 A. D., by John on the Isle of Patmos, and was the last book John ever wrote, and he was the last apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the earth. If I should admit all that he says, it would not prove Joseph

Smith was a prophet of God. A man must be called of God as was Aaron, and Aaron was never called to preach the Gospel of Christ, never was called to administer. If we take up Aaron's case, we will find that there is not a man on the earth today who was called of God as was Aaron, and for the purpose for which Aaron was called. He was called to be a Priest of the Aaronic Priesthood, and if another man has been so called in our day, then he would have to officiate as Aaron did in the Aaronic Priesthood. I want to refer again to the 5th article of their faith. They believe that "A man must be called of God by prophecy and by the laying on of hands by those who are in authority to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof." Now, we do not believe this statement for the reason that I have already pointed out to you. We do not believe that my friend Mr. Rich was any more called of God by prophecy than any other man who preaches the Gospel, and we want him to prove it if he has been so appointed. Another article of his faith says, "We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecies, visions, healing, interpretations of tongues, etc." Now, what I want to know is, what the "etc." of this article is. You can never learn that by listening to a Mormon preach or by talking to a Mormon apostle. There is a secret in it somewhere, and you have to wait until you have been admitted into their church before you ever find out what the "etc." is, do you see?

Now, I have shown you that their church organization is unlike the organization of the church which Christ established, and it claims to have the office of the Aaronic Priesthood, and of the Melchizedek Priesthood, and that there are various officers in their church organization that are not even named in the church of Christ. I want you to bear in mind that Mr. Rich has admitted that the new testament Scripture is a sufficient guide to salvation, for when I asked my friend what we must do to be saved, he just turned to the Acts of the Apostles and read what is recorded here; what is recorded right here in this book, to get the answer to give to men and women as to what they should do to be saved. By giving this answer, he admits that this Scripture is sufficient. You see, I have him bottled up again where he can never get away. Now let us examine again this Priest-

hood which Joseph Smith claims to have received. We are told by Mormon ministers that an angel descended from Heaven in a cloud of light and that he laid his hands upon the heads of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery and ordained them to the Aaronic Priesthood, and then told them to go and be baptized. Joseph baptized Oliver and then Oliver baptized Joseph, and they laid their hands upon each other and ordained each other to the Aaronic Priesthood. Now, what I want President Rich to tell us is why this Priesthood was conferred twice on these men. I have asked him before to tell us if it did not take when it was conferred by the angel, and if it did not take then, how did we know that it took when they laid hands on each other? I want him to tell us further if that is the way in which Aaron was called, if an angel came down and laid his hands upon Aaron and then told Moses to go out and baptize Aaron, and Aaron to baptize Moses. Is that the kind of a call that Aaron had? I want to insist again that my friend has admitted that the Bible was a sufficient guide to salvation in answering my question, and that it is not true that any of these books that he referred to as being lost contained any information that was necessary for the children of men. He cannot do this, and he cannot prove that there is any need for the kind of authority upon which he has been insisting. I told you when I was on this subject before that I would show you from his own books that no such authority is necessary, and I now read to you from his Book of Commandments, from the revelations given to the church through Joseph Smith:

> "That if any man has a desire to preach the Gospel and to save souls, that that man is called of God."

I want to remind you again that I have pointed out the fact that there were officers named in his church that were not even mentioned in the church of Christ, and that in order to get these new officers in the church that Joseph Smith had to have a new revelation to suit his condition. Mr. Whitmer, one of his early followers, declared that when the church was organized Joseph Smith was only the First Elder in that church, and that was the highest office in the church. There was no such office as that of High Priest in the church when it was first established. So I say again

my friend, that you never did have a call from God as did Aaron, and any man who puts up such a claim as you have put up to this audience for divine authority, should be willing to show by the signs that follow that he is divinely authorized. You have insisted that the church must have officers who were divinely appointed, that no man save he be an oracle of God, has a right to preach to the people. Now, I do not claim to be an oracle of God, and I deny that Mr. Rich is an oracle of God. God has never spoken a word to the human family through him or through any member of his church. If He had, they would be able to show to the people the same manifestation as was shown by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. He would be able to confirm the testimony of his mission by signs and miraculous manifestations of spiritual power, for these were given in the church which Christ established for the building up of the faith of the members of the church, and of convincing the unbelievers. Not one single member of the church has ever had that power, and I want to say that so far as their authority is concerned, I know that it is not recognized of God, and that the whole shooting match of them are infidels. I want to prove to you now that they are infidels. I hold in my hand a book published for the purpose of exposing some of these Mormon doctrines that are contrary to the teachings of the Bible. Here is a statement from a catechism for the children of their church. The question is asked, "Are there more Gods than one?" and the answer is given, "Yes, there are many Gods and their number is increasing." Jaques Catechism, page 13. Another statement on this subject, "The head God called the Gods together and they sat in grand counsel as to whether they should go down and create a world and people it." Statement from Millennial Star, 1844. This statement is also quoted in Mr. Roberts' Doctrine of Deity, page 129. All through their teachings you will find a statement that the word God wherever it is used in Scripture should be rendered Gods. They believe in a plurality of Gods. More than this, they teach that God is nothing more than an exalted man, and that men have got to learn how to become Gods the same as all Gods have done before them. This doctrine may be found in their Journal of Discourse, Millennial Star and Roberts' Doctrine of Deity, and

various others of their church work. Coming down to the days of Brigham Young, we read in one of his sermons recorded in the Journal of Discourses that Adam is the only God with whom we have anything to do. I have given you enough quotations here to show you that they do not teach the God of the Bible, and that they do not believe in the God of either the Old or New Testament. I am not trying men in this discussion, but we have a perfect right to try Joseph Smith, to measure his teachings with the word of God because he puts up claims that no other man put up, and that cannot be substantiated by the use of the Holy Scriptures. He gave a revelation on polygamy, and said that it was from God. He gave various other doctrines which his church has suppressed, and even now a large majority of his organization do not believe in the Adam God idea, and deny that it is their teaching when questioned by a sectarian minister. If their doctrine of God is true, then it would appear that Joseph Smith would stand at the head of this posterity, and that he would be the Prince and King, and hold the keys of their salvation. This people worship the Adam God, and when they teach in the third article of their faith that they believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel they again utter an untruth, because they do not believe that doctrine. They believe that men must shed their own blood or that they must have their blood shed by others for the remission of grievous sins. Now, neither this doctrine of the Adam God nor this pernicious doctrine of blood atonement can be justified by the Holy Scriptures, but because the Bible is a dead revelation to them they do not need to have them justified. They deny the truth of the Bible, and, therefore, they may teach any doctrine they please. You see my friend, I know what Joseph Smith teaches as well as you do, and I am reading to you from your own books. Mr. Rich has said that I have constantly made light of the prophets, believing only in the dead ones, and denying living prophets, but I insist that I am simply asking for a proper interpretation of the Bible, and that I am not willing to allow anything to enter as coming from God that does not find sanction in the Holy Scripture. It is true that the prophets who

gave us the Scriptures are dead, but that does not mean that the word which they left for us cannot be read and interpreted, or that it is dead. Peter says that "the word of the Lord liveth and abideth forever," and Paul said, "And this is the word of the Lord, that if any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." Now I have shown you that in this doctrine of Adam God and blood atonement, that Mr. Rich and his followers are teaching another Gospel, and that they are, therefore, accursed. I want to get them out of this terrible mess into which they have fallen. I feel sorry for them for their ignorance and delusion, and I shall be glad to convert them from the error of their ways. Mr. Rich agreed that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent to the House of Israel, and yet they claim that after more than nineteen hundred years Joseph Smith sent others to the House of Israel to offer them his Gospel. I read from the 29th chapter of Second Nephi, from their Book of Mormon, beginning with the 12th verse:

> "Behold, I shall speak unto the Jews, and they shall write it, and I shall also speak unto the Nephites, and they shall write it, and I shall also speak unto the other Tribes of the House of Israel which I have led away, and they shall write it, and I shall also speak unto all nations of the earth, and they shall write it; and it shall come to pass that the Jews shall have the words of the Nephites, and the Nephites shall have the words of the Jews, and the Nephites and the Jews shall have the words of the lost tribes of Israel, and the lost tribes of Israel shall have the words of the Nephites and the Jews."

Now, I have shown you that this statement can never be true because 'last of all" God sent His Son to the House of Israel, and when they rejected Him, they were destroyed, and the Gospel given to another people, so that Joseph Smith was a false prophet when he spoke upon this subject, and their voice of warning and their Book of Mormon are untrue. John the Revelator saw that in the last days the Books should be opened and that out of them the people should be judged. The Book of Mormon was not in existence, and John had no knowl-

edge of it or that it would ever come, and yet he said that out of these books the people should be judged. John evidently believed that the Bible and the New Testament Scripture was sufficient unto salvation, and that this new book brought forth by Mr. Smith was not in any sense essential to the salvation of the souls of men. These New Testament Scriptures are the Scriptures from which the world is to be judged in the last day. I have shown you also that after Christ came it was not necessary that other apostles should come, and I remind you of His words when He said, "I will be with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, my friend said last night that I had run out of powder. Well, maybe I have, but my time is growing short, and from now on I am going to use dynamite. We want now to come to the facts in this case. We are here to discuss Mormonism. Mormonism is on trial here. These people are out among us preaching this Gospel which I have shown you tonight is pernicious, and we want to expose it to the public gaze. They move around among the people and teach them out of the Bible, saying nothing about these other doctrines which they hold, and they deceive the people. After they get them so far along, and after they have become members of the church, they introduce them gradually to all these other things, and after you become acquainted with these hellish doctrines, which I have referred to tonight, you will not back out simply because you are ashamed to after going so far. That is what we are trying to do, to expose Mormonism here and to say to you that Joseph Smith's call to the ministry was not a divine call, and that there is no school of Mormonism in the world that can establish his teachings. Mormonism is a fraud from start to finish, and I am not only prepared to defend this proposition at greater length, but I have several friends here who are perfectly capable and willing to do so.

THIRD NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

PRESIDENT BEN. E. RICH.

I want to ask Brother Bunner if he will loan me the book from which he has been reading, and I will send it back to him by nine o'clock in the morning. I have never seen such a book before, and I would like to examine it. I will promise you, Brother Bunner, to deliver it to your home by nine o'clock in the morning. (Brother Bunner replied, "I will leave it to my brethren here and my Moderators.") "I thought you were running this debate, Mr. Bunner." (Moderators.) "Why, let him have it if you want to." (Bunner.) "Well I have no objection, you may take it over night." (Brother Rich takes the book.)

Brother Bunner says if anyone should ask me what they should do to be saved I would simply read from the Bible, and that I had nothing else to offer. He said that believers in the divine mission of Joseph Smith have nothing else to offer. This is what he wants you to believe, but it is not true. Statements that I read to you from the Bible, showing what a man must do to be saved are simply the letter of the requirements, and we read that the word killeth but the spirit giveth light. To tell a person, therefore, what he must do to be saved unless you couple it with the right to act in the authority of God would not bring him salvation. I have pointed out to you that in telling a person what to do to be saved I should emphasize the need of such authority on the part of one who officiated for God as was held by Aaron and by all those who were called of God as was Aaron; that without such authority these instructions that are given in this Bible would not be sufficient guide for our salvation from Sin. That is what I said, that is what I still say; that without this authority to officiate in

the name of Jesus Christ the Bible will not satisfy the requirements for salvation any more than a man's hunger would be satisfied if you read to him from the Bible the account of that magnificent feast given by Belshazzer. The Apostle Paul said to Timothy that the day would come when men would not endure sound doctrine but after their own lusts they should heap to themselves teachers having itching ears, and they should turn away their hearts from the truth, and should turn unto fables. There is scarcely a sacred ordinance or a principle that belonged to the Gospel of Jesus Christ when it existed nineteen hundred years ago that this man has not turned his back upon and ridiculed and said that it was no longer needed. He has made light of the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ, removed from it officers who were placed in it by Jesus Christ, and taken from it the spirit of revelation which was to be its foundation stone. He says that Mormonism is on trial here tonight and I want you to see that he is trying to force that subject into this question. I want to say to you and him that I will defend Mormonism when the proper time comes. When I have finished with the subject under discussion (and it seems to me that we are almost through with the subject of the debate simply because he has no more powder left and his argument now has reduced itself to sarcasm and jokes), then I will tell you what we teach, what Mormonism teaches. He pretended in the beginning of this discussion that he was ashamed of anyone resorting to story telling in this debate, yet it seems that this is all he has now left. So far as the original question is concerned, with his ridiculing and making light of the principles of Christianity he stands here tonight as a complete fulfillment of the prediction made by Paul to Timothy, that the time would come when men would not endure sound doctrine. He denies the necessity for God having anything to do with the Church in this day. He has said there were no demonstrations of the Holy Spirit, except on the Day of Pentecost and in the house of Cornelius, but I want to say to you that this statement is untrue. There were numerous instances in which the Holy Ghost was conferred by the

Apostles of Christ, and the power to lay on hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost was given to them by Jesus Christ. He has referred to Simon the Sorcerer repeatedly saying that Simon wanted this power. He did not tell you that Simon had been in the business of deceiving the people, and that he saw plainly that a greater power than he possessed had been made manifest among the people and he wanted that power for the purpose of making himself more influential, and for the additional purpose of using it as a means for making money. There are many men in the world today who want that power for the purpose that Simon the Sorcerer wanted it, and who would abuse it in the same way did they possess it. This evil intent of Simon was made known to Peter when he said unto him, "Thy money perish with thee, to think that the power of God can be purchased with money." You see Peter was an old-fashioned preacher. He was not in the habit of preaching for money. He was a member of the old school, and the Apostle Paul and the other apostles belonged to this same school. The Apostle Paul, said,

> "My reward is this, that when I preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ I preach it without money, that I abuse not the power that I have in the Gospel."

Now, my friends, do you think Brother Bunner belongs to that class? Is he earning his living day by day as a tentmaker? for this is what Paul did, and devoting his spiritual energy to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ in order that he might not abuse the authority which had been given in the Gospel. I suppose Brother Bunner would be highly insulted if you should insist upon his earning his living as all my brethren here, the elders, earn theirs, by daily toil, and that he, like they, should preach the Gospel without price. I am forced to the conclusion that if any of you should offer him a little money this evening he would willingly accept it. Why, if he had had his way about it last night, we would have taken up a collection, for he made this proposition. Now I want again to insist upon the kind of authority that is necessary to preach the Gospel. We have in the 19th chapter of the Act of the Apostles a

clear-cut demonstration of what is done with authority, and of the uselessness of officiating without it. There the Apostle Paul on his missionary journey, meets some disciples who have been baptized, and he inquired of them, "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you were baptized? and they answered him, "We have not even heard whether there be a Holy Ghost." I am afraid Brother Bunner has also forgotten it, but Paul said, "Unto what baptism then were ye baptized?" and they answered, "Unto John's baptism," and then Paul said unto them, "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance saying unto the people that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is upon Jesus Christ." The whole story of this conversation is not given in the Bible, but there is enough of it given, when we properly understand the word of God and the way in which He works for us to understand why it was necessary that the apostle should take them down into the waters of baptism again and afterwards confer upon them the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. Now I do not laugh over this proposition at all, though you may call it a second baptism, but I see in it a disposition to recognize the authority of God as manifested through His properly appointed officers. In this case after Paul had laid his hands upon these people, they received the gift of the Holy Ghost and the same was made manifest, yet my friend has said that this gift was received only on two occasions. I want to tell you there are certain ordinances in the church that are as everlasting as the Gospel itself is everlasting. No man can say, and successfully prove his statement, that God Almighty sent His Son to the earth to teach a religion that would only be necessary for a few hundred years, and after that would be forever taken from the earth. Suppose Mr. Bunner here should take with him some other minister of other denominations and go to a heathen nation and should say to them, "I have come here with my brethren to ask you to believe in this Bible." The question would be asked of him, "Well, what is it?" my friend would reply, "It is the word of God, it contains the Gospel that will give you salvation."

"Well," says the heathen, "I will read it," and as he reads he discovers that it speaks here and there of apostles and prophets being placed in the Church, and he asks the question, "Are these officers in your organization?" Brother Bunner replies, "Oh, no; they are no longer necessary; they have been done away with." "But will you show me where it says in this record they have been done away with?" "Oh, no; I cannot show you where it says they shall be done away with, but they are no longer necessary." "But," says the unbelieving friend, "I see here that this Jesus spoken of, said that those who believed in Him should have certain signs and blessings and gifts given unto them. Are these in your Church today?" "Oh, no; they are no longer necessary; they also have been done away with because they are not needed." Then the heathen turns to all the other ministers who are with Brother Bunner and receives the same answer. What do you suppose would be the effect upon the mind of this unbeliever? If he were converted to the Gospel as taught in the book they had given him to read, would he be satisfied with this form of Godliness which they were offering him as their Church? Brother Bunner has said here repeatedly that prophets and apostles were no longer needed and he has tried to show you by falsely interpretating Scriptures why they should cease. I want to tell him that when that which is perfect has come; when the time comes when we shall know as we are known; when we shall stand face to face with God our Father; even then apostles and prophets will have a place in the Church, will be assigned their distinctive ministry, because that principle of the Gospel of Christ is as eternal as the Gospel itself. At that time there will be no veil between God and ourselves. We will not look through a glass darkly or through a glass at all, but we will see Him face to face, and we will know even as we are known, then prophecy and other signs will no longer be needed and this is what Paul meant when he said when that which is perfect is come then prophecy and tongues will be done away, but he does not say they will not be needed before that time. When we reach that condition, but never until then, can that Scripture

be fulfilled. As I quoted to him before, if any portion of these Scriptures has ceased to be necessary to anyone it is only to those who have apostatized from the faith and not because of any desire on the part of God Himself to take these things from the earth. Brother Bunner may ridicule the Book of Mormon all he pleases, but I want to testify to you that it is the only book on the face of the earth that bears witness of the justice of God Almighty and that He is no respector of persons, because it is the only book that bears witness that Jesus Christ who was the Savior of the whole world came not only to the people of the Eastern Continent among whom the New Testament Scriptures had their origin, but that He came also among the people of the Western Continent and organized His Church among them, leaving His duly authorized agents among them as He did among the people of the Orient. If I stood as an investigator upon the mission of Christ, and someone were to tell me that He was sent as the Savior of the whole world, and that He visited only one-half of it, that He delivered His message to them and left the other half in utter ignorance; I should say that God had been unjust. I prize the Book of Mormon more highly because the testimony it gives me of the perfect justice of God as much as for any other one thing that it teaches. Nowhere else upon the earth can we find such a testimony for Christianity and for the justice of God as this information that Christ visited a nation that existed upon this continent and who existed in a high state of civilization as is being testified to by all the scholars of America who are working in this particular field of study and research. Jesus Christ was truly the Redeemer of Mankind, the Savior of the whole world, not of one-half of it. Brother Bunner can ridicule to his heart's content, he can misquote Scripture and put false interpretations upon it as long as he chooses, but he cannot without accepting the Book of Mormon, prove that God was just. According to his idea of justice, God left one-half of the world without a knowledge of His Son, their Redeemer, but the Book of Mormon testifies that after Jesus arose from the dead He visited this half of the earth and

taught this people the law of baptism with all the accompanying ordinances and gifts of His Gospel, and left His authorized servants among them, His apostles and prophets and such other officers as were necessary for the complete organization of His Church. For my part I would rather live the life of an Ingersol, honest and upright, than to teach to the world the doctrine that all men would be damned for not believing that Jesus was the Christ, and then say God Almighty gave that knowledge to only one-half of the earth and kept the other half in ignorance. I suppose if Brother Bunner had been a member of that company of angels God sent to the shepherds to sing Glory to God and to tell them of the coming of Jesus Christ, that if after performing that mission to the shepherds in Jerusalem he had seen the earth turned around under his feet showing a populous nation on the side of the earth that lay in darkness when morning broke over Jerusalem, he could have gone back to God in Heaven with a lie upon his lips by telling his Father his mission was finished. But the message from God that came to the shepherds upon the plains of Bethlehem was given also through the prophet Samuel upon the plains of the American continent, and he proclaimed the birth of the Christ Child. God in His justice would never have received His messengers back into His presence with their mission only half accomplished. And the Book of Mormon is the only record that tells us this most wonderful truth. Whether my friend believes it or not, I want at this time to leave with you my testimony that God has given me the knowledge that this half of the world did receive the knowledge of Jesus Christ, that they did receive His personal ministration. I suppose my friend here would be content to let all those people go to hell to frizzle and fry and burn and sizzle for a hundred million years because no record of Christ's having visited them can be found in the Bible. I want to ask him what provision is made in his church for the salvation of those members of the human family who died before the Gospel of Jesus Christ came to the world. We are told that there is no other name given under Heaven whereby man can be saved. What

then is to become of the millions of people who live and die without hearing the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Are they going to be measured by that narrow, contracted and damnable doctrine that is taught by this man who denies the right of God to reveal His mind to men? The Apostle Paul, in speaking upon the glories of our Father's Heavenly Kingdom, says:

> "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star different from another star in glory, So also is the resurrection of the dead."

Paul received this knowledge through the spirit of revelation. It could not have been made known to him except by such a spirit. He received it from that same Christ who taught His disciples that in His Father's house there were many mansions. Ministers talk about the narrowness of Mormonism, but I want to say to you that it is the broadest religion in all the world. It reaches from Heaven down to the depths of hell; it teaches that all men will be saved and exalted who desire salvation and who are willing to pay for it in right thinking, right living and a proper knowledge of Jesus Christ and His teachings. It teaches moreover the doctrine that all men in this life and the next will hear the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. It reaches down to the depths of hell, and I am not ashamed to say that the members of the true Church of Christ will follow where their Master went, yes, down into the very depths of hell, and preach the Gospel of the Master as He Himself preached it during the days His body was resting in the tomb. The Master had taught this Gospel while He was upon the earth, and the Apostle Peter tells us that when He was put to death in the flesh, he was quickened by the spirit and he went to preach to the spirits in prison, to those who once lived in the days of Noah and who had been disobedient before the flood, and in doing this, Christ demonstrated the truth of what was said by Him to Peter, that the gates of hell should not prevail against Him. Now I want to say to you, Brother Bunner, in all kindness, that I ask no greater privilege when I leave this earth than to be permitted to follow my

Master right through the gates of hell and teach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ to you after you have paid the uttermost farthing for rejecting it here and to those who are like you. Mormonism teaches that every man will have an opportunity of receiving the true word of God.

Now I think I have opened up enough of the Mormon question to give Brother Bunner the opportunity he so much desires, to devote his entire attention to that question. Tomorrow night and the night following Brother Bunner can say anything he pleases about me and my people. Since the first night of this debate he has been void of arguments on the question we came here to debate, he has proven he wants nothing but Anti-Mormonism and now, having no opponent on the question at issue, I stand ready to defend Mormonism and her people.

FOURTH NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunnell.

We do not admit the truth of what my friend has said about the lost books of the Bible. So far as the inspired books of the Bible are concerned, we have them all. Brother Rich served notice upon me a few evenings ago that before this debate was over he would jump on me with both feet. Well, now he has jumped on the Bible with both feet, and has torn it into smitherines and cast it to the four winds of Heaven and made it null and void. This is what he has done with the Bible. He has entirely set aside the last member of this proposition, namely, that the New Testament Scripture, as given to us by Christ and the apostles in Palestine, is a sufficient guide for men and women to salvation from sin. I call your attention to the fact that I have proved this proposition already. Not only have I proved it from the Scriptures of Eternal Truth, but my friend, Mr. Rich, has now admitted it himself. I call your attention to his answer to the person who is asking what he should do to be saved, when he turned to the Acts of the Apostles and said, "I would give him the same answer that was given by the apostles in primitive times." He admitted that these Scriptures were sufficient unto salvation. This question was asked of the apostles in primitive times, and in a sermon preached on the Day of Pentecost, the correct answer was given, and it is said that there were added to the church at that time about three thousand souls. These people were told to give heed to the Scriptures, and there were no other Scriptures in existence for the people of the Christian Church than those that were given by Christ and His apostles, and in using that Scripture to answer the question put to Mr. Rich, I insist that he admits they are

sufficient for our salvation from sin. I say that this is admitting the truth of this proposition. He did not turn to any other book, he did not mention the Book of Mormon, or his Book of Commandments, but he read several passages from the Acts of the Apostles and other places in the New Testament, and these constituted his answer. This is all that I claim, that the complete answer is here, and that we need no other book.

I want now to call attention to his statement concerning the Bible. When he was trying to set it aside, you will remember he told us at that time it was only a history of an organization that once existed, and that it could not be a guide to salvation. Now he admits that it is our only guide to salvation. Do you see he contradicts himself then as to what the Bible is. Now let us call attention to another thing in the argument. Suppose that we admit that all the apostles are dead and that their writings are of no effect, that would not prove the Book of Mormon to be true. For more than eighteen centuries that book was hid away according to Mormonism, and was not had among the people, and they were all this time without a knowledge of the Gospel. When it did come to light, how did it come? Why it came in a language which Joseph Smith called reformed Egyptian. Nobody ever heard of such a language until the Book of Mormon came to light. It was translated by the use of a breast plate and a urim and thumim attached to it something like Aaron wore on his breast. The writers of that book are all dead, and so it is also "dead letter" according to the argument of my friend. Why? Because its writers are all dead and gone and for eighteen centuries the people were without any knowledge of the Gospel, but now that it has come to light the Mormons themselves do not use its teachings; so you see they practically contradict their theory. They claim to draw all their Gospel out of the King James' translation of the Bible, and this is what they use. Now I want my friend to pay attention to these things and to the inconsistencies in his teachings. With reference to the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, I want to ask through what kind of a person did it come.

It came through Joseph Smith, and he was a sinner. Then God chose a sinner to make known His revelation to the world. I am not going to talk about the character of this man; we will just let that be, just for the present, but he tells us that the book was given to him by an angel and that Oliver Cowdery assisted him in translating this book. While they were translating, they came across a passage about baptism for the remission of sins, and so they went to the Lord in prayer. They were told that they must be baptized for the remission of their sins; that there is no salvation from sin without baptism. Their sins were then charged up against them at the time they were translating this book. He had not received pardon for his sins up to this time for he had not been baptized. I want you to pay attention to this argument that God chose a sinner whose sins had not been remitted by baptism to translate this book. After he received his instruction from the Lord, he and Oliver Cowdery went out together and Joseph baptized Oliver and Oliver baptized Joseph. Then they laid hands upon each other, and the Aaronic Priesthood was given to them. I want you to notice another thing in connection with the coming forth of this book. This man Joseph Smith read in the Bible that if any man lacked wisdom he was to ask God and so he went out to get wisdom, and what did he get? Why he got the most wonderful vision that was ever heard of. No man that ever lived on the earth ever received such a vision as this man did. Two individuals made their appearance in the midst of the Heavens and they did not touch the earth. While standing between the Heavens and the earth, one spoke and said to Joseph, "This is My Beloved Son, hear Him." Then Joseph Smith, Jr., saw the Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father face to face. But the Book of God declares that no man can see His face and live, but Joseph Smith saw His face and lived many years after, until he was murdered. Now the Apostle Paul said, in speaking of Jesus Christ, "And last of all He was seen of me." Now I want you to pay attention to this. If He was seen last of all by the Apostle Paul, how could He have been seen by Joseph

Smith? This would make Paul out a liar. Joseph Smith says, Paul, you are mistaken, last of all He was seen of me. Now you know I have several times called attention to these words, "last of all," and I say that no man has ever seen Jesus Christ since Paul saw Him "last of all." Paul's statement is true, but whenever you prove that Joseph Smith has seen the Lord face to face, then you make Paul out a liar. Do you see this argument, then, this man who was a sinner still in his sins, went out and saw God face to face. Now you can take the words of Joseph Smith or the words of the Apostle Paul upon this subject. You can believe whichever one you please.

My friend tried to make a good deal of sport out of my use of the words "last of all" he was sent to the Jews, but I want you to notice that Joseph Smith was never sent to the Jews. Now you get around that if you can. I want you to try your hand on this. Now if Jesus Christ was the last one sent to the Jews, then Joseph Smith was not sent to the Jews, and I have got you bottled up on that. Now with reference to his lost books of the Bible, I want to say to you that if these books were actually lost that does not make the Book of Mormon true or prove that it is from God. It would not prove that any of Joseph Smith's revelations were from God. You will have to prove that in some other way. I defy any man or any minister among their people to affirm this proposition that so far as the Bible is concerned we do not have all the inspired books of the Bible that God intended us to have. If my friend will affirm this proposition, I will deny it. I will at all times stand ready to deny it. I stand ready to deny that those books that were lost were inspired books. When Paul delivered his wonderful address on Mars Hill he quoted from the books written by the Greek poets and quoted the truth from them, but these books were not inspired. He didn't quote from them as giving inspiration from God, but he was ready to receive truth whenever found, on Christian or on heathen ground. This was the way with the Apostle Paul, don't you see? Does it not seem strange to you that God would give

an inspired book to one man and then allow another man to destroy it? This would be a reflection on the Divine Being to allow men to destroy His work. The books that we now have lead us to conclude that He would not suffer any of His work to be lost. These Scriptures were given, by inspiration, for the instruction of the people, and God is jealous of these books and He knew how to preserve them, and none of them were lost. God would not suffer that either man or demon could destroy the books of the Bible, don't you see? The books of the Bible either in translation or in the original were so widespread throughout the country that even when an order went forth to destroy the library it was impossible to destroy the books of the Bible because they were so widely scattered, don't you see, and if it were impossible to destroy the Bible, it would be equally impossible to destroy any books that belonged in the Bible, and even if one manuscript were to be destroyed, would there not be many thousands remaining? You could not destroy them. In the 1st chapter of Luke we find the following statement:

> "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us."

Now in this statement Luke included more than himself. He included Matthew, Mark, John and others who were preparing the statement of the Gospel as we now have it in the New Testament, and Luke stated that these things were committed unto us and that they had a perfect understanding of these concerning which they wrote. Now how could they have a perfect understanding if they needed these books which are lost, according to my friend's argument? I have heard a great many lectures against the Bible, but I have never before heard such a dash made against it, even from any individual as I have heard from my friend Mr. Rich.

Now as far as the matter of the Bible is concerned, I want to say that it has stood the test of ages. It could never be overthrown, it is still standing the test, and is read by more people and is translated into

more languages than any other book in the world. If my friend wants to continue his warfare against the Bible, I am ready to meet him on that question, and to show that the Bible is a complete record in spite of his doctrine of the lost books. Now Mr. Rich has admitted that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent to the House of Israel, and this kills his claim that Joseph Smith was sent as a prophet to Israel. If Christ was the last sent by God to the House of Israel, why then their Voice of Warning in which Mr. Rich believes is not true because on page 205 it says that the missionaries of the Mormon Church were sent to the House of Israel, therefore, this book does not tell the truth, and of course it is a false revelation.

Now with reference to the organization of the Mormon Church, I want to say that it has no likeness whatever to the organization of the Church of Christ. Mr. Rich has spent a great deal of time showing that apostles and prophets were necessary in this organization, but he does not mention the other officers that are found in his church and that are nowhere mentioned in Holy Scripture. There is no such office as the First Presidency spoken of in the Church of Christ. Where do you find an officer of that kind set forth in the Scripture of Eternal Truth? Such an office cannot even be found in the Book of Mormon. When this man Joseph Smith wanted to be the president of his church, why, he had to get a new revelation in order to justify him in an office of this kind. How about the office of patriarch? Where could such an officer be found in the Church of Christ. The first Patriarch of Joseph Smith's church was his father, who pronounced his blessings upon the people and charged them for it. Where do you find an officer of this kind in the New Testament? Did God say anything about a patriarch who was to get considerable amounts of money from innocent people by pronouncing blessings upon them? So far as there being just twelve apostles is concerned, I want to say that Christ had more than twelve apostles. He had twelve who were apostles to the Jews and he had others who were apostles to the Gentiles. But Mr. Rich's church

has just twelve apostles, and yet they tell you that John is still living somewhere upon the earth, but they have supplanted him in his place. If he is upon the earth and theirs is the true church, then he should be an apostle in that church and why did not he ordain their other officers and apostles? I want to call your attention now to some things in their teachings that I think you should know. First they teach that Jesus Christ is the Son of Adam for they teach that Adam is our God. I am quoting you now from their own books; from a book written by Mr. Jaques, from Mr. Robert's Doctrine of Deity, and from their Journal of Discourses. In these you will find their doctrines of God. I am reading them from a little book compiled for the purpose of showing the ideas of God, that are prevalent in the world. They also preach a doctrine of blood atonement, that men must have their blood shed in order that their sins may be remitted. Now men who preach Adam God and blood atonement, preach a new Gospel, and we have shown you that if any man preach a new Gospel, he is accursed. (Time.)

FOURTH NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

PRESIDENT BEN. E. RICH.

I had become quite accustomed to Brother Bunner misquoting the Bible, and I had become accustomed to his misquoting me, but I haven't yet become accustomed to his using the doctrines of my church in the way he does. He has done considerable of this right along through this discussion, but he rather did it up brown tonight. He placed me in just a reverse position from the one occupied by a person who was on trial and whose attorney made such an eloquent plea in his defense that he was acquitted, and as he shook hands with his attorney after his release, he said, "I really thought I was guilty until I heard your speech, but I don't know about it now." If I believed one word of what Brother Bunner has said about us I would say I really thought I knew something about the doctrines of my church until I heard him, but if they are anything like he portrays them, I am ignorant of what Mormonism is. Brother Bunner accuses me of having destroyed the Bible. You who have attended this discussion all through, let me ask you the candid question, and you can answer it for yourselves, who has confined himself more closely to the question, Brother Bunner or I? How many times have I asked him to stick to the Bible and to the subject under discussion. He said I admitted that the Bible was sufficient to guide men to salvation from sin because in answer to that question, what shall we do to be saved? I would read to the inquirer from the words of the Apostle Peter, and that this constituted an admission that the New Testament Scripture is sufficient. How boldly and how dishonestly he misrepresents me; he dodges entirely the fact that I proved divine authority must accompany the interpretation of

the words of the Scriptures and that no man could officiate in the name of Jesus Christ who did not have such authority. I have insisted that this Bible is a dead letter without divine authority, that it cannot baptize anyone, that baptism is essential to salvation, and that baptism can only be administered by one who is properly called. No man can take the authority upon himself of baptizing another. I have repeatedly said that the Bible is a dead letter so far as authority to officiate in its teachings is concerned, and that in so far as it describes the organization of the Christian Church it is a history of something that did exist, the same as the history of the Confederacy is a history of something that once existed. Brother Bunner knows that this is what I said, and he wilfully misquotes me. He said further that I had done away with the Bible by claiming that the Book of Mormon was the only book that justified God, but he did not tell you in what way this does away with the Bible. I do not believe that he was honest in his own heart when he made that statement. He understood me perfectly when I declared that the Book of Mormon was the only book upon the earth proving God to be just and that Jesus Christ was the redeemer of both halves of the world, not one, and that without such a book or some such record that the Bible alone could not bear testimony to the justice of God, for He would be manifestly unjust if He sent a Savior to only one-half of the world and then damned the whole world for not receiving Him. This is what I said, and Mr. Bunner could certainly understand it. He further says we do not use the Book of Mormon, but let us see how much he knows about that subject? Why, my friends, when the Book of Mormon was first published there were men in the city in which it was published who organized themselves and expressed a firm determination that that book should not go out to the country; that its sales should be prohibited, and that it should fall to the ground a dead letter. But how different the history of its progress has been from the plan made for it by these men. There is not a nation upon the earth to whom that book has not been carried. It has been published

in more than a score of different languages and we are continuing to translate it into others as fast as the Gospel is carried to these nations. It is printed in the English language now in single editions of one hundred thousand copies at a time. In God's name what do we do with the Book of Mormon if we do not use it? Do we use it for kindling wood? Brother Bunner tried to make a point that Joseph Smith was in sin when God first appeared to him. He did not say anything about the other apostles who had been called of God. I suppose if he had been living in those ancient times when men were called to act as God's agents upon the earth, he would have insisted that those men should not be chosen because they were in sin, and yet God chose them and recognized them, and offered them an opportunity to repent of their follies, and gave them forgiveness of their sins. Had Brother Bunner lived in those days he would have been so shocked that he would not have followed any of the prophets of God who lived anciently, but would have been with those who called Christ Himself a blasphemer. Joseph Smith could not have been much of a sinner when God spoke to him first, for he was then a farmer's lad between fourteen and fifteen years of age. He was unlearned, it is true, at that time as a boy, but unlearned as a man, never. He lived only a little more than thirty-nine years upon the earth. More than half of these years his life was sought after by wicked and designing men. He was persecuted as the prophets of God have always been persecuted during their lives upon the earth, and yet he found time to learn more and to do more than any other man whose private life or whose life's labor we have any sufficient knowledge of (save the Master Himself). He translated the Book of Mormon by the power of God. This record was delivered to him by an angel from Heaven, and it was sent in fulfillment of the promise that God made to John the Revelator upon the Isle of Patmos. You will remember that John in that magnificent vision when he looked down the stream of time to our own day, and saw "That an angel would fly through the midst of Heaven having the everlasting Gospel to preach to them

that dwell upon the earth, unto every nation and tongue and people crying with a loud voice fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of His judgment is come, and worship Him who made Heaven and earth, the seas and the fountains of water." You will find this Scripture recorded in the 14th chapter of the Book of Revelations, and it was in fulfillment of that Scripture that the angel of God visited Joseph Smith and designated him to fill the mission that was to be performed among the children of men. The Book of Mormon, as well as the Bible, contains the everlasting Gospel, it was brought to earth by an angel and is a history of the ancients who lived upon this continent, and of the mission of Christ to them. The Lord said to John, "Come up hither, and I will show you things which must be hereafter," and among the things he saw that should be hereafter was this angel that God would send through the midst of Heaven having the everlasting Gospel to give to men upon the earth. Now I want to tell you that God would not send an angel to earth to deliver the Gospel if the authority of that Gospel were already upon the earth. I have shown you that the world had the history of the true Church of Christ, but they had lost the authority which was necessary to make the work of this ministry effectual, and history that is not coupled with divine authority can have no saving power. Mr. Bunner refers to the lost Scriptures, and he tries to spiritualize away my argument on this subject by telling you what the Reverend Mr. So and So has to say about it. Now, my friends, this is the way Mr. Bunner gets all his inspiration. He gets it from men. Paul said the time would come when men would not endure sound doctrine, but would heap unto themselves teachers who would teach for doctrine, the commandments of men. He claims that some of these lost Scriptures were not inspired and yet I showed you that there were among them epistles written by Paul and by Jude. Why were they not as much inspired as are their other epistles which are found in this Bible? You see how easily he is able to twist the truth to suit his own convenience. I have answered the arguments which Mr. Bunner has presented, but I have

one other left that I want to consider for a few moments tonight, and that is the argument that Christ could not be a High Priest while on earth. Mr. Bunner asserted that Christ could not be a High Priest before he went into Heaven. I have challenged Mr. Bunner to prove this statement, but he has left it as a mere assertion without offering one line of proof. I want him now either to prove it or acknowledge he was mistaken. I haven't time to go into the argument, but I will ask you to read, in order that you may get a proper understanding of this whole question, the first ten chapters of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Mr. Bunner has quoted from this epistle a line here and there, and has tried to convey the idea that this epistle is easily interpreted. President William R. Harper, the late president of Chicago University, the greatest Hebrew scholar perhaps that America has produced, and certainly America's foremost Bible student, once said in speaking of this epistle:

> "If anyone doubts the high scholarship of the Apostle Paul, let him read the espistle to the Ephesians. This epistle testifies also the high intelligence of the people of Ephesis, for it stands as the most scholarly piece of sacred literature that we know anything about, and its interpretation is so far above the ordinary human mind that it is completely misunderstood by a large majority even of the ministers who attempt to interpret it."

I haven't the time here, as I have said, to give you a proper interpretation of this Scripture, but I may give you a sort of summary of these first ten chapters, then ask you to read them and ponder over them in the light of what I shall say. It will also be necessary to read, in order to get a proper understanding of this subject a large part of the epistle of the Hebrews, indeed all through the writings of Paul, we find reference to this subject. I shall give you here a summary of the whole question. My friend has told you something about Christ being a High Priest and that He could not have been a High Priest and remain upon earth. He made this statement with the view of ridiculing the idea of High Priests being the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day

Saints. It is said that where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise, and perhaps nothing that I can say will have a tendency to lift this minister from his blissful ignorant grave; but to you who probably have not taken upon yourselves such a deep sleep, I want to say that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was taught to the Israelites; that at one time they had certain officers belonging to the true Church of Christ and the office of High Priest was one of the offices in that Church. These High Priests were in the habit of entering a certain sanctuary once a year for the purpose of offering up sacrifices which were sprinkled with blood in commemoration of the great sacrifices that they knew would some day be made upon the earth. Melchesidek was such a High Priest in ancient times. No place in the Bible does it say that Christ could not have been a High Priest if He had remained upon earth. I want to make the declaration to you that so long as Christ was upon earth He was a High Priest, because He held every office and every authority belonging to His Gospel and the High Priesthood belonged to that Gospel. The passage that Brother Bunner should have correctly quoted to you is found in the 4th verse of the 8th chapter of Hebrews. Brother Bunner interpreted this Scripture to mean that if Christ had remained upon earth He would not be a Priest. But in order to understand it you must read very carefully the whole of Hebrews from the first to the tenth chapter. It will take all of these chapters to tell you in what sense He would not act as a Priest, because this passage has that meaning. These chapters teach that when the Gospel was taken from the Israelites the Law of Carnal commandments was given to them, and that the office of a Priest belonged to the Levitical Priesthood under which the people received the law. Therefore as we are told in the 7th verse that the Priests had nothing but the law to deal out, what necessity was there for another High Priest when they did not have the Gospel in its fulness. But as Paul says in this same chapter, there being a change in the Priesthood there was made of necessity a change in the law. And when Christ came to earth with that which was once

rejected by the Children of Israel He brought back the Higher Priesthood and therefore He would not act in the name of a Priest in order to deal out the law of Carnal commandments. On the contrary, He changed many of these Carnal commandments, for example, the law was no longer "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," but love your enemies and do good to them that despitefully use you. In all this He did not do away with the lesser Priesthood even if He did change some of their laws. He still retained the officers of the lesser Priesthood; and the apostles following His example attended to their business in their greater and higher calling, and left the officers of the lesser Priesthood to attend to the duties of the Aaronic Priesthood.

Now, if friend Bunner will receive a little information, let me tell him that this Gospel that Christ brought back in lieu of the Carnal commandments was the new and everlasting Covenant, and every principle that He taught is a part of it now and forever, and always will be a part of it from everlasting to everlasting.

There is one other point that I want to discuss with you briefly tonight, and that is this. Friend Bunner has tried to make you believe that God would not reveal Himself any more to men upon the earth, and I have tried to show you that no sectarian minister can tie God Almighty up so that He will not speak when occasion requires. As it was in the days of Cornelius, that just and good man, when God poured out His Holy Spirit upon them, so shall it be whenever God sees it is necessary to instruct His children. At this time, realizing that Peter was a stubborn man, determined to go only where Christ had told him to go, God saw it was necessary to reveal to Peter the fact that the Gospel was to be given to Cornelius. By means of a vision God taught him a lesson; and there is no doubt in my mind that Peter was still pondering over that vision when God gave this extra demonstration of His power at the home of Cornelius in order to convince Peter that the Gentiles were entitled to the Gospel. Mind you, I am giving you this as my opinion, not as Scripture, and if Brother Bunner would be equally candid and distinguish between his

own opinions and assertions and his Scriptural references, a very few minutes would be sufficient to summarize every passage of Scripture that he has correctly quoted. I want, however, to point out the fact that this opinion of my own which I am expressing upon this subject is entirely reasonable. I want the few moments that I have left this evening to ask Brother Bunner a few questions specially prepared, which I shall read, and which we will expect him to answer before this debate is over.

Brother Bunner, since you have so much ridiculed our idea of Deity, will you explain what Christ has done with His body, which He invited the doubting Thomas to handle, and how it is possible for such a Christ to sit on the right hand of God, who does not Himself have a right hand?

Did you mean to mislead this audience or were you ignorant of the truth when you asserted that the first revelation given by Joseph Smith said that if any man had a desire to serve as God's representative he had that right? Such a statement or any statement like it cannot be found in the Book of Mormon or in the Book of Covenants.

Mr. Bunner, you concluded from these words of the Apostle Paul, "last of all He was seen of me," that it would be impossible for the Savior to show Himself to Joseph Smith nineteen hundred years after these words were written. You have also repeatedly asserted that the Book of Revelations is the last of all the Holy Scriptures. Will you explain then this statement of the revelator?

> "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day and heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: . . . and I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot . . . and when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not, I am the first and the last, I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more."

Was not this appearance of the Savior to John after His appearance referred to by Paul? This statement seems significant in view of what you have said on the subjects of the prophecy of Joseph Smith.

Dr. Blackner of Vermont, an instructor in legal medicine of the Barnes University at St. Louis, Mo., said before a class of two hundred and fifty students that the prophecies of Isaiah and other prophecies of the Old Testament were no greater than those made by Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, save that time and distance lends enchantment to the view. Will you disprove before this audience, this statement of Dr. Blackner by quoting a more reliable authority?

Mr. Bunner, we demand proof of your statement that the Prophet Joseph Smith said that if Brigham Young ever became President of the Church he would lead it into hell.

FOURTH NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

Mr. Rich has told you that you would have to read about ten chapters of the Hebrew letter and also a large part of Ephesians in order to understand what we have had to say about Christ being a High Priest, but you would have to read a lot more Scripture than that to prove that Joseph Smith was a High Priest. He cannot prove that Joseph Smith was a High Priest of God unless he can show that he was ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices. We have challenged him to show a single gift possessed by Joseph Smith, and he cannot show one because he never had one. But I have shown you Jesus Christ could not be a High Priest while upon the earth, and I need only to read one verse again to show that this is true. You will find it recorded in Hebrews 5th chapter and 5th verse,

> "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an High Priest, but he that said unto him, 'Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee.'"

And he said also in another place,

> "Thou art a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

Now if Joseph Smith was ever ordained a High Priest, he was ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, and I want to know what gifts and sacrifices Joseph Smith ever offered. I want to know what sin offering Joseph Smith ever offered, and yet the Priesthood of Aaron was authorized to offer sin offerings for the people. I have shown you further that if Christ had been a Priest upon earth He would necessarily have offered these sacrifices in the most Holy Place, and this He did not do. But Jesus Christ was called to be a Great High Priest after the order of Melchisidec when He ascended His Throne at

the right hand of the Majesty on High. So you see, my friend has made a mistake along this line, as he did upon many others, and yet he claims to be inspired. He certainly knows that if any other man should undertake to do the work of a Priest except one who was of the Tribe of Aaron, that he would be resisted by the Priest, and would be in danger of being smitten with leprosy, and that Jesus Christ would not attempt to officiate in such a capacity. I want to insist again upon the fact that if Joseph Smith was ever authorized by God as a Priest, that he must have been set apart to offer sacrifices for sin, and the fact that he did not offer sacrifices for sin is an evidence that he was not a Priest after the order of Aaron, don't you see? But we were told that no man shall take this honor unto himself except he be called of God as was Aaron, and Joseph Smith was not so called. Now Mr. Rich bases his claim to being a properly authorized servant of God upon these Scriptures that we have read, and yet I have proved to you that in no case had they applied to him or his people. Jesus did not take this honor upon Himself, but Joseph Smith did not hesitate to take it upon himself to be both a Priest after the order of Aaron and a Priest after the order of Melchisedec. Jesus Christ was made a High Priest when He went into Heaven, but not while He was upon the earth. There is another thing that I want to insist upon tonight, and to have my friend clear up for us. He insists that I am not a believer because I do not believe that the gifts of the Spirit are exercised among men today, but I have demanded here repeatedly that he show us some evidence that he possesses this miraculous power. I have asked him to speak in a foreign tongue or show us any other sign of the divine approval of his authority. He will tell us that these signs are not for the unbeliever, but that they follow only the believer, and I want to assure you that they were seen by the unbelievers in the days of the apostles. They were for the purpose of converting the unbeliever. If my friend had been filled with the Holy Ghost, as he claims to have been, he would not make the mistake that he has made during this discussion, don't you see, and I have pointed

out many mistakes he has made in his interpretation of Scripture. If his testimony, then, is not true in one case, how can it be true in another case? I want to call your attention to another statement made by Jesus Christ when he quoted to the people the Old Testament law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. He announced his right to change the law with the understanding that he was about to establish a new order of things, and I have tried to show you that this new order of things was the new covenant spoken of by Jeremiah and fulfilled in Christ, and I have challenged my friend to show that there was a newer covenant than this. Mr. Rich asks me to give proof for my statement that Joseph Smith said Brigham Young would lead the church to hell. Some of his reorganite friends are in the audience, and they would probably give him the authority for this statement. I want now to exhibit a picture of Joseph Smith. You see in this picture that I hold before you this prophet of the Lord dressed in the uniform of a soldier. He placed himself at the head of an organized army, equipped and marshalled for war. More than that, this man who claimed to be sent of God to lead men in the way of life and salvation, aspired to the Presidency of the United States, and had his name placed upon the ballot by his own people. Do these things impress you as being the right things for a divinely inspired prophet of God to do? I want now to refer again to the lost Scriptures which my friend made so much of the other night. If these Scriptures are lost, are they necessary to salvation, and if they are, should they be placed among the Scriptures that we are given by Joseph Smith? If they are not, then Joseph Smith's claims to be a prophet sent from God are false for he came to restore the everlasting Gospel, and yet he has nowhere claimed to restore to the people the lost Scriptures of which Mr. Rich spoke on a previous evening. Then Joseph Smith has failed in his mission entirely as a prophet sent from God, don't you see? I want now to read that passage from Revelations which my friend has quoted, "and I saw another angel flying through the midst of Heaven having the everlasting Gospel to preach to them that

dwell on earth, crying with a loud voice, 'Fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of His judgment is come.'" In this same revelation the writer goes on to tell us that they were to be judged out of the books that were written. Now this part of the prophecy cannot possibly apply to Joseph Smith, and, therefore, the first part of the prophecy would not apply to him. The books which Joseph Smith wrote did not come into existence for centuries after this prophecy, and, therefore, out of them men could not be judged. But at the time this first vision was to take place John the Revelator saw that the hour of God's judgment had come, and it certainly did not come during the life of Joseph Smith, so we see again that Joseph Smith was a false preacher. My friend, Mr. Rich, said last night that he would ask no greater privilege than to preach the Gospel to me in hell. Well I don't know whether he will go there or not, but he certainly will not see me there when he goes. I want to call your attention to this fact that he stated that Christ went into the place of Torment to preach. He said that Jesus went into hell. Now the Bible says that He went into Hades to meet Satan on his own battle ground, but it does not say He went into hell. Hades is the place of departed spirits, and this place includes all departed spirits both good and bad, and Jesus went into that place to meet Satan on his own battle ground, to destroy him and his power, and in going there He demonstrated that He had power over death, and that the devil and his subjects were under His authority. But this Scripture nowhere tells us that Jesus preached solely to the antediluvians, and when my friend asserts that He went to preach to the wicked, he says that that is not true. Now I want to continue what I said concerning the organization of the church. It was in 1820, we are told, that Joseph Smith had his first visit from the angel, and it was not for several years after this time that he got possession of the gold plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated. Now we are told that during these years he became wicked and reckless. It is even said that he got drunk, and yet in spite of these facts God was willing to work through him for

the salvation of the souls of men. It is true he was forbidden to take the plates at the time he first saw them, but it is also true that he was in his sins when he did receive the plates, and that he began this tremendous work of establishing the church while he was a sinner. I have pointed out the fact that in the organization of his church there are many officers not even spoken of in the New Testament Scripture. I have also reminded you that Joseph Smith claimed to have seen Christ, and if this claim were true that then the words of the Apostle Paul were not true when he said, "Last of all He was seen by me." Now from the days of Christ's resurrection from the dead, we find the organization of His church upon the earth, and this new organization called the Latter Day Saints' Church will not find themselves connected with the Church of Christ at all, because they have come teaching a new Gospel other than the one which was taught by Christ and His apostles. Their organization is not in any particular like the one that came from the hands of the apostles. Christ chose His own apostles, but Joseph Smith's apostles were chosen by the people. Christ chose more than twelve apostles. Joseph Smith's people chose just twelve. Christ ordained His apostles and sent them into all the world to preach, and told them to preach to every creature. Joseph Smith's apostles were not so sent out. Christ qualified His apostles for their work before He sent them out to preach and He laid down His life for His testimony. None of Christ's apostles ever departed from the faith or denied the testimony of Jesus while nearly all of Joseph Smith's apostles fell away from the church. Oliver Cowdery, the man who assisted him in bringing forth the Book of Mormon, went entirely back on Joseph Smith, and before the close of this debate I will show you that nearly all the men who were associated with Joseph Smith in the early days of the organization of the church turned their backs upon him. His apostles then instead of going into the world sealing their testimony with their blood, as did the apostles of Jesus Christ, remained at home helping to build up the church, and to gather followers for Joseph Smith. So far as Joseph

Smith himself is concerned, it is claimed that he sealed his testimony with his blood, but you would have to put the blood of Joseph Smith on an equality with the blood of Jesus Christ to make anything out of this argument. I want now, in the few minutes that are left to me, to call your attention to certain other statements that I find in this little book that I read last night concerning my friend's idea of God. We read here that their gods were formerly human beings, that God himself was once what we now are, and is, therefore, only an exalted man. Mr. Rich defied me the other night to believe in Christ as he believes in Him. Of course I cannot do that, because I do not believe that God is an exalted man. I believe that Christ is a High Priest of the Christian possession, and that He has offered a sacrifice for our sins, and that we cannot come unto God except through Him, so I do not believe in Christ as he believes in Him, and I do not believe this pernicious doctrine of many Gods as taught by my friend.

FOURTH NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

President Ben. E. Rich.

I am going to pass over all that Brother Bunner has said this evening with just this one statement; this little pamphlet from which he reads is published by an Anti-Mormon Society, and the man who compiled it has taken disconnected abstracts from our books and from different sermons, and has put them together in such a way as to make them sound reasonable, and yet to give entirely wrong ideas. Some of them, and especially where he quotes from the sermons of Joseph Smith, have been taken just a few words here and there, and then another sentence taken four or five pages further over in the sermon. Thirty minute speeches will not permit me to read the sermons from which these abstracts are taken, but I want to say to you that Brother Bunner has convinced me beyond a question of a doubt that he has never put one single, solitary hour in honest study of the Mormon question. He has always inquired where he could find something bad that had been written about our people, something that was already fixed up against them, and he has succeeded in finding it. The man that searches after something bad always finds it. If I should take one portion of the Bible and then go way down in a chapter or into another part of the Bible and take another line, I could make it say almost anything I wanted it to say. For example, it is recorded in the Bible that Judas went out and hanged himself, and in another place Jesus said, "Go thou and do likewise." How would it look for me to connect these two items together and give it to you as the teachings of Christ. Yet there would be just as much sense, just as much justice and fairness and equally good evidence of a Christian spirit on my part if I were to do this, as there

is on the part of Mr. Bunner and his friends in doing what they have done. I will tell you the Mormon idea of God and of men becoming gods. I cannot go into this discussion fully at this late hour, but Mormonism teaches that those who are saved in the Celestial Kingdom of God will live in a family organization; that every man will stand at the head of his own family, just as it was in the days of old when patriarchal governments existed upon the earth. You may call this a patriarch over his family, or you may call him a god over his family, if you choose, and you will be equally correct, and that family organization will be linked together right back to our father Adam and to our mother Eve, and they will preside as our first parents over the entire human family, and they will be as gods over that family. But Adam and his whole family will be subject to Christ, who will preside over all of them and Christ will be one with the Father, the Great Eternal God. Now, briefly stated, there is this whole Adam god idea explained to you. Now is there anything unreasonable about it? Is there anything that belittles the creations of God or makes Him any less the creator of worlds and the Father of our spirits than if we did not believe in this sort of family organization?

I want now to preach the Gospel just a little, and tell you something from our side, inasmuch as Brother Bunner has misrepresented so much of it, and has represented us so falsely. I have shown you that he has drawn his inspiration and his false information from the souls of those who are as bitter as hell against us. He knows nothing himself about the books he has mentioned. He has never read one of them, but he takes these disconnected statements made and prepared and dished up by ministers who have had their hearts filled with the bitterness of hell towards Joseph Smith and that is the only kind of information or inspiration he has wanted on this subject. I want now to read you something written by some people who do not have this fanatical bitterness in their hearts. First, however, let me read a few of the short prophecies of Joseph Smith that have had their literal fulfillment. When he was in Carthage immediately before his assassination,

he said to a group of officers and men who had assembled in front of his hotel and who were curious to see and speak with this man who was causing so much interest in their community: "Gentlemen, you cannot see what is in my heart and you are therefore unable to judge my intentions, but I see what is in your heart and I will tell you what I see. I can see that you thirst for blood and nothing but my blood will satisfy you. It is not for crime of any description that I and my brethren are continually persecuted and harassed by our enemies; but there are other motives and some of them I have expressed so far as they relate to myself. I prophesy in the name of the Lord that you shall witness scenes of blood and sorrow to your entire satisfaction. Many of you who are now present shall have an opportunity to face the cannon's mouth from sources you think not of." I need not remind you that this prophecy received its literal fulfillment in the Civil War.

When Stephen A. Douglas visited the prophet at Nauvoo, Joseph Smith said to him, "Judge, you will aspire to the Presidency of the United States, and if you ever turn your hand against me or the Latter Day Saints, you will feel the weight of the hand of Almighty God upon you, and you will live to see and know that I have testified the truth unto you for the conversation of this day will stick to you throughout your life." Judge Douglas did aspire to the Presidency of the United States, and that too at a time when the nomination of his party was regarded as equivalent to an election. But the Judge had turned his hand against Joseph Smith and against the Latter Day Saints, and when the election was over and he was defeated by Abraham Lincoln, the truth of this prophecy came over him with overwhelming force. He died soon after a broken-hearted man. Joseph Smith prophesied that the Book of Mormon would go to every nation of the earth, and that too at a time when the fulfillment of such a prophecy seemed utterly impossible. He also said that his name would be held for good and evil throughout the world, and that at a time when there was no reason to believe he would be remembered any longer than any other unknown boy in like circumstances

in life, but these prophecies have both had their fulfillment. The Book of Mormon has gone to every nation on earth, and the name of Joseph Smith has been held for good and evil throughout the entire civilized world. Another prophecy that is significant, "I prophesy that the Saints would continue to suffer much affliction, and would be driven to the Rocky Mountains, that many would apostatize, others would be put to death by our persecutors or lose their lives in consequence of exposure and disease, and some of you will live to go and assist in making settlements and building cities, and see the Saints become a great and mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains." Let me ask those of you who have seen that great western empire established by the Mormon people, if this prophecy has not had its literal fulfillment. Today, from Canada on the north through the entire length of the Rocky Mountains to Mexico on the south, there are cities and villages and happy homes to testify to its literal fulfillment.

Let me call your attention to a statement made by Josiah Quincy, who made a special visit to Joseph Smith and had a long conversation with him only a short while before the assassination of the prophet. Josiah Quincy, you will remember, was at one time the Mayor of Boston, and afterwards a member of Congress. Mr. Quincy has this to say about the prophet:

> "If the foretelling of future events that could not possibly have been seen by human wisdom, events and their subsequent fulfillment evidences as unlikely to come to pass, if the prediction of such events and their subsequent fulfillment evidence a true prophet, then Joseph Smith must have been a true prophet."

It was in 1844 that Mr. Quincy made this visit to Joseph Smith, and this remarkable statement, which I have just read, was not made until 1882. During this time Mr. Quincy had seen the literal fulfillment of Joseph Smith's prophecy of war, and of many other prophecies with which he was perfectly well acquainted. Mr. Quincy also remarked, in speaking of Joseph Smith, that he was "Born in the lowest ranks of poverty, without book-

learning, and with the homeliest of all human names, he had made himself at the age of thirty-nine a power upon the earth. Of the mutitudinous family of Smith, none had so won human hearts and shaped human lives as this Joseph. His influence whether for good or evil is potent today, and the end is not yet. If my reader does not know what to make of Joseph Smith, I cannot help him out of the difficulty, I myself stand helpless before the puzzle."

I have introduced these statements here to give Mr. Bunner an opportunity to reply to them tomorrow night. I now pass on to another part of my subject. If you want to know anything about a Catholic or what a Catholic believes, if you want to know anything about a Methodist or what a Methodist believes, I would advise you to go to a Catholic or a Methodist for your information upon that subject. If you want to know what a man believes you should not go to his enemies to find out about him and if you want to know what a Mormon believes, you should not go to men who are prejudiced as this man is and of whom I have truthfully said, "he has never spent an honest hour in an investigation of Mormonism." He does not even have the decency in speaking of the prophet, but to speak of him as "Joe" Smith. There are men who have investigated Mormonism with proper motives and in a proper spirit, both in the days when Joseph Smith was upon the earth and since, and we will hear from more of them before this debate is over. I want to read the articles of my faith which Brother Bunner has read to you ,and which he has so seriously misquoted. These articles of faith were written in answer to a letter from Mr. John Wentworth, editor of a Chicago paper, addressed to Joseph Smith asking what our belief was, the answer the prophet gave to the editor was afterwards adopted by the church as our articles of faith. They read as follows:

1. We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.
2. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression.
3. We believe that through the atonement of

Christ, all mankind may oe saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

4. We believe that the first principles and ordinances of the Gospel are: (1) Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (2) Repentance; (3) Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; (4) Laying on of Hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

5. We believe that a man must be called of God, by prophecy, and by the laying on of hands, by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

6. We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz: apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

7. We believe in the gift of tongues, phophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.

8. We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; We also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

9. We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.

10. We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built upon this (the American) continent; That Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, That the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.

11. We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law.

13. We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul. We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things.

JOSEPH SMITH.

I want to emphasize that we believe in the words of Jesus Christ when He said that signs should follow the believers as recorded in Mark's Gospel. "In my name

shall they speak in new tongues, they shall cast out devils, they shall prophesy. they shall heal the sick," and every other gift that Christ promised would follow his believers as recorded there. We have them in our church. Thousands and thousands will testify that they have seen them made manifest. I have seen them with my own eyes and mine eyes have not deceived me. I know that they are in the church. I have seen the sick healed, I have seen devils cast out by the power of the priesthood of God (Laughter), and those who think it funny, may some time themselves desire such service performed for them. There were those who thought it funny anciently, derided Christ Himself for performing just such miracles, but the spirit of the evil one recognized Him and recognized His authority. I have seen the signs and the gifts, which Jesus Christ promised, made manifest many and many times, and I testify to you in all sincerity that these gifts are still upon the earth. (Laughter.) No, do not laught at this assertion, by so doing you may show you believe that Jesus Christ lied when he said that the gifts and blessings would be in the church and should follow those who truly believed on His name. Brother Bunner has been waiting a long time for me to make this declaration and now he has got it. When this church was organized, it was organized with apostles and prophets, and they were sent into the world with authority to preach the Gospel and administer in its ordinances. Notwithstanding Joseph Smith being an unlearned boy, a farmer lad, an angel of the Lord came to him and told him his name should be held for good and evil among all the nations of the earth and when he made this statement of his own accord, people laughed in derision at the idea that the name of a mere farmer boy would ever go beyond the county in which he lived. Yet today there is not a nation upon the face of the earth where Joseph Smith is not looked upon as a prophet of God, and there is not a nation on earth where there are not others who gnash their teeth at the very mention of his name. I want to say to you as I said once before, that Brother Bunner's statement that Sidney Rigdon wrote the Book of Mormon, is as false as

hell. Sidney Rigdon belonged at one time to this man's church. Indeed he was a minister in that Church. When the Book of Mormon was brought to him, the spirit of God worked upon him, and he was converted to Mormonism. He took almost his entire congregation with him into the Mormon Church and these ministers haven't got over it yet. I testify to you that the three witnesses who testified to the Book of Mormon and who declared they had seen an angel; that they had held in their hands the plates from which the book was translated; that they heard a voice from Heaven declaring it had been translated correctly through the power and inspiration of God, spoke the truth. I want to tell you also that the eight witnesses who held the plates in their hands, who hefted them, and who testified to this fact; not one of either the three or the eight witnesses ever denied on a single, solitary occasion, the testimony which they had given concerning these matters. I want now to warn Brother Bunner that no man can lie about a prophet of God and stand blameless before God Almighty. I want to bear witness unto you in the name of Jesus Christ that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and it is my firm belief that if Brother Bunner had lived in the days of the other prophets he would have fought them as he is now fighting the prophets of this dispensation, because the same spirit which influences him today was in the world then, and was in those who fought the prophets of God.

I came down here to discuss a certain question; my opponent has forced upon me an entirely different one. You know as well as I know that he has not quoted me correctly; that he has not confined himself to the question. He has misquoted the Holy Scripture and has placed his own personal interpretations on every passage that he has used. I bear you my witness that the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has come back to this earth in its power and in its fulness; it was brought by an angel from Heaven and has come in fulfillment of prophecy. All the prophets from the days of Isaiah have prophesied of the coming of that Gospel in the last days. Daniel prophesied concerning it, and from that day forward the prophets of God had their eyes fixed upon this

dispensation of the fulness of time. The prophecy of Daniel in his interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar was not fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The image that stood before Nebuchadnezzar with the head of gold, the arms of silver, the belly of brass, the legs of iron, and the toes part of iron and part of potter's clay, was not perfected in the days of Christ. Christ came and ministered unto the people and organized His Church upon the earth. He was crucified and resurrected, and all this took place in the days of the part of that image represented by iron. But the second coming of Christ shall not take place until the complete destruction of the image as seen by Nebuchadnezzar has been accomplished. The Holy Scriptures tell us that before the second coming of Christ there should be a falling away, and it was plainly made known unto these apostles that the people would apostatize from the true Church, and for that reason it would become necessary for God once more to show His power and re-establish the Church in the Latter Days. John, from the Isle of Patmos. looking down through the stream of time to the days when that great image would be entirely destroyed and the Church of Christ would come back to the earth, saw it would be restored by the angel flying through the midst of Heaven having this everlasting Gospel to deliver to me upon the earth. I testify to you tonight that the wonderful vision of John, the beloved apostle, received its fulfillment in the coming of the angel who delivered the Gospel of Jesus Christ to Joseph Smith. God bless you. Amen.

FIFTH NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

Rev. A. A. Bunner.

Moderators, Fellow Debater, and Respected Audience: I am glad to be here before you again tonight to continue the investigation of the proposition just read in your hearing. After hearing Mr. Rich's efforts of last evening, and listening to him twisting around the points which I have given him to consider, I concluded there was as much need for a long argument upon this subject that he had had so little to say and had given forth such little evidence to substantiate his side of the question, that my side of the question is perfectly proved. Mr. Rich twists his Scriptures in such a way as to make them teach any doctrine he wishes to teach, and in order to reconcile one part of the Scripture with another, he reminds me of a story that I once heard of a man who was traveling on a train. He wanted to go to a point out West, and the railroad agent persuaded him to take a night train out and take a sleeper. The man went to bed and along about midnight his train was wrecked. No one was particularly hurt, but of course all of them were very much frightened and excited. This man, who was not an experienced traveler, sprang out of bed, drew on his pants hurriedly, wrong side before, and rushed out of the car. A stranger noticing him standing there shaking and trembling, asked him if he was injured, and he said, "Well, I don't feel any pain either internally or externally, but on examining myself I find that I am fatally twisted." So my friend's doctrine is fatally twisted. He has fatally twisted his doctrine in trying to reconcile various parts of the Scripture which have entirely different meanings and which cannot be reconciled. Mr. Rich has had something to say about the gifts that are in his church. I am credibly informed that in the First ward

of this city they have a member who is very sick, and that for several days past her relatives have been trying to perform a miracle upon this woman. Finally the doctor told them they would have to quit it and let the woman receive medical treatment because she was dying and delay was fatal. Now my friend has told us that he knew miracles have been performed, that he has seen all kinds of miracles performed, including the casting out of Devils. Now if he has seen Devils cast out, he ought to be able to distinguish them and tell us what kind of beings they are. If he cannot do that, then he has not seen them. Now we are told that they cannot be seen, and, therefore, Mr. Rich has never seen them cast out. It is one thing, you see, to make an assertion, but a different thing to prove it and so Mr. Rich has been bold in making assertions but we demand his proof. Now when Christ and his apostles travelled through Palestine they performed miracles. They healed the sick among all the people wherever they went, and before the eyes of the multitude, but these ministers of Mormonism travelled through the country from one end to the other and they never performed a miracle of any kind—but they pretend to. Christ healed men who had been lame from their birth. He opened the eyes of the blind and did many wondrous works among the people. Mr. Rich and his followers declare that they can do these things, but they are not willing to give us any demonstration of their power to perform these miracles. Now we want to see these things demonstrated. We do not expect to believe mere assertions that they can do them, but we want to see them done. I know that they claim that they are only able to perform for believers; that faith is necessary on the part of the person who is to be benefited by their demonstration, but according to this theory you cannot find any believers except among Mormons, and, therefore, they could not be of any service except to Mormons. Now Jesus Christ did not insist that only believers should be benefited by the exercise of His miraculous power. Take the instance of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus. Here Jesus simply raised His eyes towards Heaven and addressed His Father in Heaven, saying:

"I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I know that thou hearest me always, but because of the people which stand by, I said it that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

We see in this instance that it was because there were unbelievers present that Jesus did this miracle which was for the purpose of converting the unbeliever; not because of the faith of the friends of Lazarus. Neither Christ nor His disciples went about saying that men must first believe before they could perform miracles in their presence, but Mr. Rich and his followers will all tell you, "I must perform my miracles in the presence of believers, and that is why you non-believers cannot see the manifestation of spiritual gifts." But I want you to know that Lazarus came forward at the word of Christ. Yes, he that was dead came forth from the grave in order to make men and women believe that Jesus Christ had been sent of God. Take the instance of Nicodemus, and you again have the same condition. We see from these instances that this miraculous power that was exercised by Christ and His followers was for the purpose of convincing unbelievers that Jesus was the Son of the living God, and that all that this miraculous power was for was to convince unbelievers that Christ and His apostles were sent of God. The gift of tongues was not to believers, but to the unbeliever. Now when the prophet Joseph Smith sent out his missionaries, the Lord said to him in a revelation given to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery in Harmony, Pa., in 1830, "Command them to do no miracles unless they are required to do so," plainly meaning by this that they were to do miracles whenever they were required to do them. Now we are requiring them at this time to do a miracle in order to convince us, who are unbelievers, that they have that power. So, according to the word of the Lord to their prophet, they should do a miracle in our presence, but now we see what they answer when they are asked to perform a miracle. They always tell you that it is a wicked and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign. Their prophets said nothing whatever about making such an excuse as this, but told them to perform a miracle if it should be required of

them. Now wherever we have met them—not one faction, but every faction—we have required them to perform a miracle before we would believe, but we have never yet succeeded in getting them to do so. Now I am going to require a miracle at their hands. When the apostle Paul, who was a true follower of Jesus Christ, duly authorized and appointed to minister in His name, moved among the people he performed miracles, and when men doubted that he had that power, he exercised it. You will remember on one occasion he struck a man blind. Now I defy my friend, Mr. Rich, to strike me blind. He claims he has that power, and I defy him to exercise it before this audience. He and his co-laborers have been travelling throughout this country trying to proselyte people to their faith, and I am trying to enlighten the people on the foolish doctrine which they teach. He claims to have this power that was possessed by the apostle Paul. I dare him to use it, and I do this boldly, because I know he does not have the power and he cannot use it. I make bold to say that he has never seen a miracle in his life; that he has been deceived. I want now to call attention to the proposition which has just been read in your hearing. The proposition reads that John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were the last prophets sent by God. Jesus was a prophet like unto Moses. He was the last prophet sent of God. So far as the apostles were concerned, they were sent out by Christ. They are, therefore, not under investigation. I have shown, therefore, that Jesus Christ was the last prophet sent of God, and that He was sent to the House of Israel. Now so far as the last member of the proposition is concerned, my friend, Mr. Rich, has admitted that these Scriptures are sufficient unto salvation. He tells you that I have not stuck to the proposition, and I think I know something about what I am doing, and I am going to be a judge as to when I have sufficiently proved the proposition. Now I have done that and have had plenty of time left to consider these other matters that I have discussed with you. I have been in a great many debates in my time and I know just about as much about debating as h

does, and I know when enough has been said to prove the proposition which I am defending. I came here for a certain purpose, and I have accomplished that purpose so far as the proposition is concerned, but I had also another purpose is coming here, and that was to draw this man out upon the things that they are teaching and which he professes to believe, but I haven't succeeded in drawing him out fully, but I have accomplished that purpose as far as I have been able to. Last night he came out fully on certain doctrines which they teach, but there are other doctrines upon which I have not succeeded in drawing him out. I have had to work very hard in order to get over the amount of ground that we have covered, and I have had to work very hard to get him to tell us anything about what they are teaching. Mr. Rich has tried to make it appear that I had to prove that these new Scriptures can save a man. I did not come here to argue anything of that kind. This is not the proposition. Christ is the Savior of the world. He is our Savior, the author of our salvation, and He offered us salvation on certain conditions. He must make these conditions of salvation known to the human family, and He has done this by giving us a guide, and that guide is the New Testament Scripture, and I came here to prove that it is a sufficient guide to men and women for salvation from sin. Mr. Rich has admitted it, for when I put the question to him, if anyone should come to him and ask him what he should do to be saved what he would answer, he turned directly to these Scriptures and gave the only answer he had to give out of them. Don't you see, therefore, that he has admitted the second part of this proposition, but he insists on saying that the New Testament Scriptures cannot baptize anybody. Certainly I haven't claimed that they have that power. We claimed merely that they could guide a man in the right way to salvation, and we have proved it. Now I want to call attention again to Mr. Rich's belief. I promised myself many years ago that I would never believe anything that I was afraid to advocate, but Mr. Rich believes things that he is not willing to advocate, and that he is not willing to have brought into this discussion, because he

is not willing to defend these beliefs before a public audience. I do not believe a thing that I am not willing to stand up before any audience and defend to the best of my ability, and I will defend it from the word of God.

Now so far as saving sinners is concerned, let me say that preaching will always be necessary. Paul told Timothy to preach the word, and to be diligent in studying the word so he could preach it intelligently. He also predicted that the time would come when people would not endure sound doctrine, and for that reason that the preachers must be able to expound the Scriptures in power and in truth. There must be one who will deliver the word to the people, and when Brother Rich twists that Scripture which says, "if any man speak, let him speak as the oracle of God," to mean that no one has a right to preach the word of God without having been called by direct revelation, he tells you that that is not true. Any man who will study the Scripture has a right to show the people the way of life and salvation, and to go out and preach the word of God, and after he has converted them to a better way in life, he has a right to baptize the sinner unto Christ and to help keep him in the way of the Lord. There are no conversions today from sin without a preacher of the Gospel is present. Mr. Rich has insisted that in order for anyone to be ministered under Jesus Christ, he must be called of God, as was Aaron. Well, how are their ministers called today? Let me call your attention to a few of their own revelations, and we will see what their prophets have to say upon that subject. In a revelation given in Harmony, Pa., May, 1829, we find the statement that "the field is white for the harvet. Let him who desires thrust in his sickle and reap." Now these words are from a Mormon revelation. This is a revelation given in the beginning of Mormon history, and here the prophet said distinctly, if anyone desires to reap, let him thrust in his sickle. Now this is all we claim. If a man is a Christian and desires to thrust in his sickle and reap, he can do so. In another revelation given to this same prophet we read that "if anyone who desires to reap must thrust in his sickle and reap while the day lasts in order that he may

treasure up for his soul treasures in Heaven." In this same revelation the statement is made "that if anyone desires to reap, the same is called of God, and that if such an one will ask of God he will receive; if he will not, the door will be opened." Now there are numerous other revelations if I have time to read from them, but they are all about the same. The same spirit dedicated them, but I have read these statements to show that they give men that same authority to preach that we claim men should have—a desire to serve God and bring souls unto him. Now these revelations all just simply say that if a man desires to reap, he can thrust in his sickle and go to work, and that such a man is called of God. So you see, brother, you have been mistaken. You were not called of God, as was Aaron, and, therefore, according to your own statement you have no right to be preaching the word of God. You are a contradiction of your own revelation. Now I want to ask you, has the God of Mormonism who gave these revelations changed? He certainly has changed if what you are now teaching is true. The New Testament Scriptures teach that we are all kings and priests unto God, and that, therefore, whoever desires to minister for God has a right to do so, but my friend will tell you that when those who helped the apostles in their ministry round about Jesus were preaching the word of God that they were without authority. He has told you that when Saul of Tarsus was converted he was told that one who had been called of God should be sent to him, but this is not the way it reads. Ananias was sent to him—not one of the apostles—and he explained to Saul the way of life and salvation, and told him what to do to be saved. Now if my friend had been there, he would have said, "You are not an apostle; you are not a High Priest; you have not been called of God; you have not had hands laid upon you; you have, therefore, not received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and you have no right to instruct this man in what he shall do. You must go back and wait until you get a call such as Aaron got before you can teach this man what to do to be saved." Now let us see just what the Scripture does say, for I have shown you what their

revelations say. The Scripture says plainly the spirit and the bride says come. Now who is that bride? Why, it is the church—the man's wife. The whole church says come. The whole church of Jesus Christ, then, has a right to extend an invitation to one who has the desire to be a minister for Christ to come. The individual who hears this call of the church and who so desires has a right to come, and this is the kind of a call that was received by the men who preached the Gospel of Christ in the days of Christ and the apostles. Thus you see again that this resolution which I have formed is true, and that the New Testament Scripture is sufficient to guide men and women to salvation from sin.

FIFTH NIGHT

FIRST SPEECH.

President Ben. E. Rich.

I see Brother Bunner is still at work on his little Anti-Mormon book. It is sad for a person to be so ignorant of Mormon literature as to have to read extracts already prepared and published in an anti-Mormon book, especially when that book was written by men who have sought to find all they think is bad, and who have been willing to reject everything that did not suit their immediate wicked purpose. When Brother Bunner started to speak on the Mormon question, he spoke as though he had an intelligent understanding of the subject. He intimated that he had read the revelations given to Joseph Smith, but I discover now that he has never read one of them in his life that he is either too indolent to read them for information, or that he is searching for falsehood. This is simply proved from the fact that he has read to you wholly from garbled extracts that have been put together with a vicious intent and for a malicious purpose by men who make their living publishing anti-Mormon literature. Brother Bunner has demonstrated beyond the question of a doubt that he is willing not only to steal the revelations given to a people who were upon the earth nineteen hundred years ago, and to apply them to himself, but he is willing to steal the revelations given to the Mormon people and endeavor to construe them in such a way as to make them justify the kind of authority which he claims to have as a minister of the Gospel. There was not an epistle written except to a member of the church or to an organized branch of the Church. These epistles were, without exception, directed to the Saints. Not a single one of them was written to Brother Bunner, and in as much as he is not a member of any church to which these epistles were written, their teachings and

their instructions and their commissions do not apply to him. More than that, there was not a revelation given to the Prophet Joseph Smith that was not given to the saints. Not one of them was given to Brother Bunner, and not a single truth given in any one of those revelations can be construed in such a way as to be made to apply to him. It is a different thing to say to a man who is a member of the Church and who holds the Priesthood of the living God that the field is white for the harvest and that his services are necessary and required, than to say such a thing to a man who is not a member of the Church, and who does not hold the Priesthood of God, and it is a different thing for a prophet of God to issue such a call than for a man to call himself. Yet Brother Bunner has construed that Scripture which is recorded in the 10th chapter of Romans to mean that it could be applied to him.

To whom was this Scripture addressed? It was written to the saints at Rome, and in that same epistle you will find some of the most powerful arguments upon the necessity for baptism that can be found anywhere in the Scripture. The people referred to in these words were those who had received baptism and the laying on of hands, and who were duly authorized to take part in the work of the ministry whenever they should be called and set apart to that labor by those who held authority. But these words could not be applied to any unbeliever or to a person who had not been so baptized, and they, therefore, cannot be made to apply to Brother Bunner in this day. And yet he has taken to himself the epistles of Paul and John and of the others, and even has gone so far as to apply to himself the revelations given to the prophet of this dispensation in attempting to justify his claim to be a properly authorized preacher of the Word of God. I have succeeded in showing you that he is without authority, but I want to point out to you also this fact, that according to his own arguments, if we as a people were as bad as he has tried to make you believe we are, and if all he has said about us is true, if not a single revelation that was given to Joseph Smith is true—even then we would have as much right to be preachers

of the Word of God as Brother Bunner has. I want to insist again that he cannot find any justification anywhere in the Holy Scripture for his assertion that any man who desires to preach the Gospel has that right, and he can find nothing that can be misconstrued into such a meaning except he dishonestly appropriates to himself statements made by the prophets of God to unbelievers. I want to call attention to another of his erroneous interpretations of Scripture. Don't you let Brother Bunner make you believe that the miracles that were performed by Jesus Christ were for the purpose of converting unbelievers or for the purpose of extending His power. At no time in the history of the world has God Almighty ever shown His power or allowed it to be exercised by men upon the earth for the purpose of converting men to him or turning them from sin. To do such a thing would deprive man of his free agency. This is the thing Satan tried to do in that counsel of Heaven, when he proposed this plan in opposition to the plan which was proposed by Jesus Christ for accomplishing the salvation of the human family. Mr. Bunner falsely says again that I admit that the New Testament Scripture is a sufficient guide. He lies about me again in this particular, and I have referred to it so many times that now I am simply going to say that my time is a little too valuable to turn back and go over that ground. I have lost all hope of getting far enough underneath the hairs on his head to make him understand anything, and I have shown you that the only Scripture which he has used for the purpose of trying to convince you good people that he is right has been a line here and a line there, put together in such a way as to give utterly foolish meanings to them. It is just the same sort of thing as I reminded you once before, as if I should put these two passages together, "And Judas went out and hanged himself," and Jesus said, "Go thou and do likewise." Now I want to spend the time that remains to me to a little better advantage than it would be spent if I were to go back over his foolish argument. I have here a few questions, however, that I want him to answer for this audience before this debate is ended. I want to call his attention to some

statements he has made that are untrue, and I assure you that I do this in a spirit of kindness. Elder Rich reads:

Brother Bunner, I charge you with using dishonest methods in this debate, and I ask you to explain to this audience why, in reading the quotations which you read from Mr. Neal's book purporting to be taken verbatim from the writings of our Church, you did not indicate the stars that Mr. Neal himself had inserted there to show the omissions? Did you intend that this audience should take them for connected statements?

Brother Bunner, you made the statement that Christ did not preach to the wicked antediluvians, and that such a statement is not to be found in the Bible. Will you explain, therefore, the meaning of these words of Peter?

> "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison; Which some times were disobedient, when once the longsuffering God waited in the days of Noah. . . . "

When you made the statement that no apostle chosen by Jesus Christ ever apostatized, did you mean that Judas was not an apostate?

Did you deliberately falsify, or did you speak without proper information when you asserted that the apostles in the days of Joseph Smith did not go into the world to preach the Gospel as they did in the days of our Savior, and that, too, without purse or scrip?

Mr. Bunner, you stated the first night that prophecy fulfilled is the evidence of a true prophet. Do you deny that any or all of the specific prohecies of Joseph Smith which I cited were not fulfilled, and if you so assert, will you submit your proof?

Brother Bunner, you made the statement on the opening night that you had not been baptized by one who was called of God, as was Aaron, nor by one holding such authority. Are we to understand you to mean by this that such authority is not necessary, and that any man, therefore, has the right to baptize his neighbor for the remission of sin? (Brother Bunner thought a moment, and then answered this question in these words: "Yes,

sir, I mean that any man has such authority, provided he is a Christian.") Brother Bunner has just stated to you that any of you are as much ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as he is. If that is so, why you, any of you, could baptize your neighbors, instead of hiring a preacher to do this work for you. Why continue paying this man a salary? I have no recollection of ever seeing any statement anywhere in the Word of God that would justify my brother in his belief, and I think I have succeeded in convincing you that no one has the right to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ unless he is called by revelation and is set apart by the laying on of hands by those who have authority from God to administer His Gospel unto men.

Brother Bunner, the only explanation you have attempted to offer for the Book of Mormon is that it came from the hands of Sidney Rigdon. I ask you now to successfully controvert this testimony of his son. I want to say concerning this letter which I am about to read, that I got it in person from John Rigdon, the son of Sidney Rigdon, concerning whom Mr. Bunner has had something to say. John Rigdon was closely associated with his father during the late years of Sidney Rigdon's life, and upon numerous occasions he questioned his father about the work of Joseph Smith. The testimony of this old man made such an impression upon his son that after his father's death, John Rigdon went out to Utah and applied for baptism in the Mormon Church. In my last visit to the West I happened to meet Brother Rigdon, and I asked him if he had ever heard his father say he had any connection whatever with the bringing forth of the Book of Mormon, and it was in answer to that question that he gave me this statement which I am about to read to you. He gave it in the presence of a notary public as his sworn statement upon the subject.

Salt Lake City, Utah,
December 29th, 1911.

To Whom it May Concern:

As the son of Sidney Rigdon, I hereby solemnly affirm that my father emphatically declared to me during his life-

time that he had no part nor lot in any way, shape or manner with the bringing forth of the Book of Mormon. On one occasion, having heard the report that my father was the man who had brought forth the Book of Mormon, in order to satisfy myself as to the truth or falsity of said report, I asked him pointedly what, if anything, he had to do with the coming forth of said book, and his unqualified answer was that he had absolutely nothing to do with it. He told me emphatically and plainly that the first time he ever saw the Book of Mormon was when it was presented to him by Parley P. Pratt while he was a Campbellite minister at Mentor, Ohio. Then I asked him how he accounted for the origin of the book, and he replied that he could account for it in no other way than the way and manner in which Joseph Smith said it came forth.

That satisfied me perfectly that my father had nothing whatever to do with the origin of the Book of Mormon.

(Signed) J. W. RIGDON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of December, 1911.

(Signed) ARTHUR WINTER,
Notary Public in and for Salt Lake County, Utah.
(SEAL.)

Mr. Bunner, you have challenged me to show one thing in our books pertaining to the salvation of men which is not found in the New Testament Scripture. If time permitted, I could show you many, but I want to refer you to one of the most beautiful doctrines of salvation that God has ever revealed to the children of men in any dispensation, and which bears testimony of the justness of our Father in Heaven, in that He permits the living to perform a vicarious work—that the dead who have died without a knowledge of the Christ may receive the benefits of His holy ordinances in the Temples of the Most High God. This most beautiful doctrine was taught among the early Christians, and was understood by the apostles whom Christ left upon the earth. We have but few references to it in the New Testament because that work was of such a sacred character that it was not published to the world. To one who rightly understands the far-reaching effect of the salvation which Christ came to the world to offer to mankind, it is easy to understand why the work for the dead who have died without a

knowledge of Christ should be done by the living. Joseph Smith declared in the closing years of his life that no other work given him by God, the Eternal Father, was of so much importance as this. Our people, therefore, cherish this as their greatest privilege, the right to minister in the Temples of our God for their loved ones who were called home during the years that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was not upon the earth. God Almighty showed John upon the Isle of Patmos that the time would come when the dead, great and small, would stand before Him to be judged, and that they would be judged out of the books that were written. How necessary it is then that every soul who ever lived upon the earth be given an equal chance for salvation with every other soul, and this cannot be true except through the ministration of such an organization as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Truly, my friends, that angel whom John saw flying through the midst of Heaven having the everlasting Gospel has come to earth. He delivered the Gospel to men upon the earth, and declared that it should be preached to every nation, every kindred, tongue and people. This restoration would not have been necessary if the Gospel had not been taken from the earth, but I need not argue the question of apostasy, or give you any additional proof of the fact that an apostasy from the Christian Church took place for our Campbellite friends are thoroughly converted to that fact. I quote you from a speech delivered by Mr. Clark Braden as published in the Braden-Kelly debate, page 220. Mr. Braden says, "Thomas and Alexander Campbell, believing that the division of Christianity into denominations is unscriptural and wrong, tried to remedy it by securing a union of all followers of Christ. They undertook a restoration of apostolic Christianity and not a reformation of any or all existing denominations." I want to say in passing that if ever a man had a bitter heart in him, that man Braden had, for I have never read such slander and lying as you will find printed in the speeches of this man.

FIFTH NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

REV. A. A. BUNNER.

I shall try and call attention in this closing speech to some of the things that have been said by Brother Rich, and answer some of the questions that he has asked me to answer, and to review briefly the arguments that have been presented. I want you to notice first what he has said with reference to that word, "last of all." He has tried to show you from the Book of Revelations, which was written in 97 A. D., that John saw Jesus Christ after he had been seen by Paul. I deny that this statement is true. The Bible does not say that John saw the Savior in the midst of three candlesticks, but it says that he saw one like unto the Son of Man, and John talked to that messenger as one man would talk to another, and this messenger said that he was a messenger from Jesus Christ, and that he had come to deliver a message to John. With reference to the statement of Mr. Rigdon, Mr. Rich claims that Mr. Rigdon came and demanded baptism at the hands of some of the ministers of the Mormon Church. Well, then, if that is true, why, of course he would justify himself in palming off any kind of a statement or a fraud that would assist that church. I do not, therefore, believe the statements of this man. I do not believe one word that he says on this subject. Let us see what Cowdery, one of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, has to say about Mr. Rigdon. When he was questioned as to hearing the voice of the angel, he said that the first time he heard Mr. Rigdon speak his voice was just like the voice of John the Baptist. Now if these voices were just alike, why, then, it was the voice of Sidney Rigdon that Oliver Cowdery heard, and Sidney Rigdon was the man who delivered the plates to Joseph Smith and to Oliver Cowdery. I want you to

remember, too, that after the death of Brigham Young, Sidney Rigdon came forth, claiming to be the rightful President of the Church, and that there was a struggle for the leadership. Brigham Young declared that Sidney Rigdon had no right to the leadership of the Church, though Sidney Rigdon claimed that he had been set apart to that office by Joseph Smith. Now if Rigdon would lie about one thing, he would lie about another, and having made this statement that he was not the author of the Book of Mormon, why, naturally, he would stick to it. You see, then, if Sidney Rigdon himself would lie about these things, his son would do the same to help palm off this imposition. Let us see now what there is in this story about baptism for the dead. Let us read what the Scriptures have to say about it, 1st Peter, 3d chapter, 18th verse:

> "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometimes were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah."

Now Mr. Rich claims that He preached only to those who were wicked, and I claim that Christ preached to all those who were in the spirit world, that this place to which he went as the resting place of departed spirits, and that there were hundreds of thousands of Adam's race there. Why should He go then only to the few that Mr. Rich claims He went to? Why did He not give all the rest a chance as well as the antediluvians? Now concerning his doctrine of baptism for the dead, he admits himself it is not a new doctrine, but that it can be found in the New Testament Scriptures, and if it is in these Scriptures of eternal truth, it is not a new doctrine, and is like all the rest of the revelations of Joseph Smith. It is a fraud and not from God, but a suggestion which he found in the Scriptures of eternal truth. Now I want to say with reference to the questions which he has asked me to answer that we haven't the time to answer all of them, and that they don't amount to anything, anyway. Mr. Rich quotes some statement as saying that the Mor-

mon Church will have to be reckoned with, but this man does not say how it will have to be reckoned with. I want to tell you that the Mormon Church will have to make a reckoning. It will have to answer for all its crimes of bloodshed, and for all the other crimes it has committed. It has committed crimes not only against the government of the United States, but against humanity, and of course it is something that has to be reckoned with. Look at its crime of the Mountain Meadows and the blood that it spilled at that time. Why, of course, that blood was brought on to this generation, as it has in all generations past. Reckoning will be had at the hands of the institution that has taken it upon itself to shed blood. There was among them at one time an organization known as the Danites, whose purpose was to kill off any man or set of men who opposed the church. Of course, this church will have to give an account for the crimes done by these people. Of course, it has to be reckoned with, and God will reckon with it. This man who claimed to be called of God, as was Aaron, instituted an order of marriage, and claimed that he had a legal right and a divine right to perform marriages, and that no man who was not so called had any right to perform marriage ceremonies. They claim that all you people who have been united in marriage by any Presbyterian minister are living in adultery, and in violation of the laws of God. This is the teaching of this institution, that is represented here tonight by my friend, Mr. Rich. Do you people believe this? Do you sanction such doctrine as this? They do not teach you this when they teach the first principles of their Gospel. They get into your good graces first, then they introduce these things to you little by little. I have shown you that the men who were associated with Joseph Smith in the organization of his church turned their backs upon him, and that when they gave their testimony in defense of the church, they were hypocrites. Cowdery was one of the witnesses who testified that the Book of Mormon had been delivered to them by an angel of God, and yet he declared that Joseph Smith had usurped authority, and had introduced officers into the church who did not belong there.

At one time or the other his statements must have been untrue. Mr. Witmer, another witness to the Book of Mormon, declared that when the church was first established it had in it no such office as the First Presidency, that this was a later introduction, and that it was not made known until years after the church was organized. He declared that in Kirtland, Ohio, years after the church had been organized, the first High Priests were appointed to the office of High Priest, and that at that time there were many present who could not speak because their faces were distorted into demon-like shapes, and this because of the displeasure of the Lord. Now these are the testimonies of men who my friend may tell you never went back on their testimony, and yet this man who claimed to have received revelations from the Lord Jesus Christ introduced these officers into his organization long after the church was first established, and that the Lord was so displeased with him because of these things that He allowed the devils to come in and twist their faces all out of shape, don't you see? Now I believe the testimony of these men is true when they say that the power of the devil came among the followers of Joseph Smith. Now Mr. Rich has been very plain in his statements that I have not been telling the truth, and I want to remind you that if I have been lying I have only been keeping up with my friend, that is all. Mr. Rich has claimed that there are celestial marriages in the world, and that there will be a family organization in the world to come. I want to remind you of the words of the Savior. On one occasion when some of His enemies thought to trap Him and asked Him the question, "Master, we know of a man who married a wife and he died and left no issue, and his wife remarried and again was widowed, and so on for seven times. Whose wife will she be in the resurrection?" And the Savior said unto them that in the resurrection from the dead they would neither marry nor be given in marriage. Jesus then very plainly taught that we would not live in a family organization.

So far as this little book is concerned from which I have been reading, I want you to know that there is not

one word in it which I have read that is not taken directly from their own works—from Brigham Young, from Joseph Smith, Jr., and from others of their great preachers and writers, and that there are no mistakes made in it because they give you here chapter and verse, and you can go to their books and read them for yourselves. Why, a man who would get up a document of this kind and claim that it was the teachings of any organization would be liable to prosecution and a penitentiary sentence if his words were not true. Why do they not handle the man who got up this book and who does not state the truth? Why, because they know that these statements are true. Mr. Rich knows that these quotations are correct. Mr. Rich tried to belittle my friend, Mr. Braden, who held a debate with Mr. Kelly of the Reorganite Church. I read the debate. I have got it in my possession. Mr. Rich says if ever a man had a bitter heart it was Clark Braden. Now Brother Braden was doing nothing that he did not have a right to do. I suppose if Brother Rich had his way, he would call him a child of the devil. But I suppose if he had been there when the Apostle Paul was reviling some people who were wicked and called a certain man a child of the devil, an enemy of all righteousness, he would have said that Paul had a vile heart and was not in possession of the proper spirit. I want to say to you that it is just as much the duty of a minister of God to oppose error in all its forms and wherever he finds it, as it is to preach and try to get men and women to obey the Gospel of truth. Now I am not mad—I don't get mad. I am simply desperately in earnest, and I here to contend for the truth as it is written in the Scriptures, and I will defend to the very last notch, and contend for it to the very last. My friend here knows very well that I wanted this discussion to go on for twelve evenings. I have matter enough prepared for twelve evenings and to give a thorough investigation to the questions of difference between his church and mine. I want to say here that I would be glad to stand up for twelve or fifteen days and investigate the claims of the Mormon Church, and I will take my quotations from their own books and establish the

fact that Mormonism is not what it claims to be, the true religion of Jesus Christ. Now I love my friend, Mr. Rich, and I am trying to enlighten him. That is just what I am doing, and this is why I am standing before this people to bring him back from the error of his ways. Mr. Rich told you last night that I did not believe in baptism by immersion. I did not say that. I said that baptism by immersion simply meant baptism, and that he might as well say baptism by baptism, or immersion by immersion—that baptism by immersion is silly talk. I want to call attention to another statement that he has made about Joseph Smith. He said that the boy could not have many sins when the angel appeared to him, and yet Mr. Smith said himself at a later period that the Lord said unto him, "Thy sins are all forgiven thee." Now if he had no sins, why was it necessary for the Lord to say, "Thy sins are forgiven thee"? But after his sins had been forgiven him, he still taught that baptism was necessary, and therefore Mr. Smith's baptism was not for the remission of sins. Now I say that the angel who Mr. Smith claimed delivered the Gospel to him was a fallen angel, because he delivered another Gospel than that that was taught by Christ and His disciples, and Paul, in his Gallatian letter, says:

> "If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed."

And in order that he should not be misunderstood, he said further that:

> "Though we or an angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Mr. Smith claimed that an angel appeared to him and told him his sins were forgiven before he was baptized, and then turned right around and commanded him to be baptized for the remission of his sins. Do you not see how very inconsistent this man's teachings are? I want to remind you again that the angel ordained these two men to the Aaronic Priesthood. Then why was it necessary for them to ordain themselves? (Time.)

FIFTH NIGHT

SECOND SPEECH.

PRESIDENT BEN. E. RICH.

In spite of what Mr. Bunner has said to you, I want to show you again that baptism is for the remission of sins. Peter said, on the day of Pentecost, that people should be baptized for the remission of their sins. There is one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and that baptism referring to water baptism is for the remission of sins. Jesus Christ was void of sins. I wonder what Brother Bunner would have said to Him if he could have witnessed Him coming down into the waters of baptism to be baptized by John? He probably would have said the same as he says about Joseph Smith. He probably overlooks the fact that Jesus Christ even though John felt his own unworthiness to baptize him, said, "Suffer it to be so now, John, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Christ, who was without sin, went down into the waters of baptism to fulfill all righteousness, and so Joseph Smith, who had had it said to him when he was a boy, "Your sins are forgiven you," was commanded to be baptized for the remission of sins, and in order to fulfill all righteousness he could not have fulfilled all righteousness without being immersed. Brother Bunner insists on quoting to you that statement of the Apostle Paul that "If any man preach any other Gospel, let him be accursed." You will remember I have quoted that passage to you and given it proper interpretation. I have been contending here for the last five nights for the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it was in the day and age in which Paul made that statement. This man has been using his time in telling you that those things that were taught by Jesus Christ and His apostles were no longer necessary. I would like to call Brother Bunner to repentance and baptize him for the remission of his sins,

and hold him under the water until it takes. He ought to be baptized for this sin, among many others—falsifying and lying about the best people upon the face of the earth. This corrupt system of Mormonism, as he calls it, about which he has told you so many untruths, has produced some wonderful results. More than ninety-five per cent of the members of this Church own their own homes. They have flowers growing in their dooryards, and numerous happy children playing about their homes, praising God day and night. Do you not think it strange that a bad system should produce such good results? Nowhere else in the world can there be found a happier people living in good homes and upon the fruits of their industry? Brother Bunner says we teach that all men and women not married according to the laws of our Church are living in adultery. (Turning to Brother Bunner.) Oh, you falsifier. Any man or his wife who has joined our Church in any portion of the world will tell you that we teach that people must obey the laws of their country; that we uphold the laws of every land; that we recognize every marriage under the law of every state and in every country. He cannot help but fling the Mountain Meadow massacre before you, when that subject has been worked over and over and over again, and when the whole world, except a few ignorant and fanatic ministers has come to know and acknowledge that the Mormon people did not do what they were accused of doing. This matter was brought before the committee of the Smoot investigation and it was proved beyond a doubt that the Mormon Church was in no way connected with the affair of the Mountain Meadows. Years before that time in opening the case to the jury, the district attorney, who was acting as the prosecutor, and who was an officer of the United States, stated that he came there to try John D. Lee and not Brigham Young or the Mormon Church. He said he proposed to prove, because he had the evidence in his possession that the officers of the Mormon Church were in no way connected with the matter, and this and much similar corroborative evidence was brought out in the Smoot investigation.

Mr. Bunner still does not believe that Christ went to

preach to the antediluvians. Peter said He did. Now I do not cite these words of Peter to belittle Brother Bunner's great knowledge of what Christ really did do, but to show you how little Peter really knew about it. Mr. Bunner has had a good deal to say about Oliver Cowdery, and I want now to tell you something on that subject myself. Oliver Cowdery engaged in the law, and practiced for some years in Michigan after leaving the Church. One day a gentleman said to him, "Mr. Cowdery, I see your name attached to the Book of Mormon. If you believe it to be true, why are you in Michigan? Mr. Cowdery, do you believe this book?" "No, sir," was the reply. "Very well," continued the gentleman. "But your name is attached to it, and you declare that you saw an angel, and also the plates from which the book purports to be translated, and now you say you do not believe in it. At which time did you tell the truth?" Oliver Cowdery replied, "My name is attached to that book, and what I there have said is true. I did see an angel and I know I saw one, and belief has nothing to do with it, as a perfect knowledge has swallowed up the faith which I had in the work, knowing, as I do, that it is true." This was Oliver Cowdery's testimony in his latest hour. He returned later and was baptized and taken back into the Church. I have here his testimony, as well as the other witnesses. Oliver Cowdery's testimony. "I beheld with mine eyes and handled with my hands the gold plates from which it was transcribed. I also saw with my eyes and handled with my hands the Holy Interpreters. That Book is true. Sidney Rigdon did not write it. Mr. Spaulding did not write it. I wrote it myself as it fell from the lips of the Prophet. It contains the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, tongue and people. It contains principles of salvation, and if you, my hearers, will walk by its light and obey its precepts, you will be saved with an everlasting salvation in the Kingdom of God on High. I was present with Joseph when an holy angel from God came down from Heaven and conferred upon us or restored the lesser or Aaronic Priesthood, and said to us at the same time that it should remain upon the earth while the earth

stands. I was also present with Joseph when the higher or Melchisedec Priesthood was conferred by holy angels from on high.

The Whitmers at Richmond, Missouri, told me this about Oliver—that they never saw a happier man die. Happy because he had returned to the Church and had been restored to fellowship.

I want also to give you the testimony of David Whitmer. When David Whitmer was a very old man I sent him my autograph album and asked if he would write in it. When he returned it to me I found in it this statement: "My testimony to the Book of Mormon is true." With his signature attached. David Whitmer did not deny his testimony as a witness to the Book of Mormon, and only three days before his death he called his family to his bedside and told them he was going to die and wanted to bear his testimony to them before he passed away. Turning to his physician, he said, "Dr. Buchanan, I want you to say whether or not I am in my right mind before I give my dying testimony." The doctor replied "You are in your right mind, for I have just had a conversation with you." Then, for the last time in his life David Whitmer bore a faithful and unfaltering testimony in regard to the Book of Mormon, and reiterated what he had said so many times before that his testimony recorded in the Book of Mormon was true. I want also to give you the testimony of Martin Harris.

Many times during his life Martin Harris bore a faithful testimony to the truthfulness of the Book of Mormon. It was not until 1870 that he moved to the valleys of the mountains, and soon after reaching there from the stand of the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City he bore a faithful testimony in regard to the truthfulness of that book. I listened myself to his statement that he had seen the plates, saw the angel and heard the voice of God declaring its truthfulness.

EIGHT WITNESSES.

Christian Whitmer, one of the eight witnesses, died a faithful Latter Day Saint in the Church. He lived in

Jackson County, Missouri and subsequently in Clay County and was the object of much persecution. He remained faithful and true to his testimony and also to the Church. His brother, Jacob Whitmer, left the Church. His sons, who were interviewed in 1888 in the presence of a number of his relatives all said that he was true and faithful to his testimony regarding the Book of Mormon to the day of his death, and that he was always anxious to testify to all who would listen.

Peter Whitmer, Jr., filled a mission among the Lamanites and traveled 1,300 miles to the Delaware Tribe of Indians. He remained faithful and true to the Church to his death.

John Whitmer was the first Church historian. His son was interviewed in 1888 at the old homestead of his father in Far West Caldwell County, Mo.; also a daughter, who lived nearby, and both of these testified that their father had at all times remained faithful to his testimony given in the Book of Mormon.

Hyrum Page remained faithful to his testimony, though he fell away from the Church. His son, Philander Page, declared in 1888 that no man who ever lived bore a more fervent and zealous testimony to the divinity of the Book of Mormon than his father, Hyrum Page.

Joseph Smith, Sr., the father of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, died a faithful member of the Church and true to his testimony.

Hyrum Smith, who died a martyr with his brother, remained faithful to the Church and to his testimony given in the Book of Mormon.

Samuel H. Smith, who through persecutions heaped upon him, followed his brothers, Joseph and Hyrum to the grave thirty days after their martyrdom, remained true to the Church and to his testimony given in the Book of Mormon.

Brother Bunner, you assert that Jesus was a prophet and that He commissioned His apostles, but that the Apostles of Joseph Smith received their commission from Joseph Smith. This is not true in the sense you mean it. If Joseph Smith ordained anyone to the priesthood, he did so by authority from those who ordained him to

this power. I want now to give you such a chain of authority as you have never heard of before. I myself was ordained to the Melchisidec Priesthood under the hands of Elias Smith. He was ordained under the hands of Hyrum Smith, who was ordained under the hands of Joseph Smith. Joseph Smith was ordained to the Melchisidec Priesthood by Peter, James and John, and they were ordained by Jesus Christ. There are, therefore, only four links in my chain of ordination back to Jesus Christ, Who was sent with authority from God. I wanted to say this because I have so often called your attention to the fact that without prophets God would do nothing; that where there are no prophets the people perish, and Mr. Bunner has not attempted to answer this argument. Mr. Bunner has said nothing at all concerning my argument for the Book of Mormon as a justification of God. I have insisted that it testifies to His justice in giving the other half of the world a knowledge of the redeeming blood of Jesus Christ, and in giving them also His personal ministry with a Church organized under His personal direction. In ignoring this argument he has admitted its truth, that it is an argument unanswerable. God is just and the Book of Mormon bears the strongest testimony to that truth. Mr. Bunner has misrepresented us again in saying that the First Presidency as an office of the Priesthood are not apostles. Each member of the First Presidency of our Church is an apostle, and they officiate under the authority of their High Priesthood. Mr. Bunner talks about there being thirteen apostles, but he says nothing about the Apostle Barnabas, of whom he reads in the New Testament. He held up in derision the fact that Joseph Smith had a uniform, but had he lived in the days of Joshua and many other prophets of God and had been a true follower of some of them he would have been following a uniform. So you see, Joseph Smith was not the first, claiming to be a prophet, who wore a uniform. Let me advise my opponent to read his Old Testament a little more closely before using the matter of a uniform as an evidence of a person not being a prophet of God. During every night of this debate, Mr. Bunner, you have dared

me to perform a miracle. I have refrained from saying anything about it until now. I have hoped, but in vain, that there would be a change in your heart. But now I want to tell this congregation in your presence that the first individual who ever asked Jesus Christ for a sign was the devil himself, and there was not a man who ever demanded a sign from Christ who was not actuated by the spirit of the devil. The devil took Jesus upon the pinnacle of the Temple and dared Him to throw Himself down, just as this minister continues to dare me to do something. Satan said unto Him, "If you are the Son of God, throw Yourself down. Because it is written that the angels take charge of Yourself," and the answer Jesus gave to the devil is the one that I now give to Mr. Bunner, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Again, Satan dared him to turn stones into bread, but upon every occasion Christ answered that same spirit and said that it was a wicked and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign. These are the words of Christ, Mr. Bunner, in whom you profess to believe, and whom you declare always spoke the truth and never told a lie, and I want to tell this congregation in your presence that whenever they see a sign seeker, whenever they hear a minister or lay member daring someone to work a miracle for them, to let the memory of Christ's words sink deep into their hearts, that it is a wicked and adulterous people who demand such signs. Now then my brethren and sisters—for you are my brothers and sisters, because we all belong to the great family of God—I again repeat to this minister the words of Christ to Satan, "Get thee behind me Satan." (Here Elder Rich's coat tail fairly flapped in the face of his opponent. Laughter.)

I want to leave you my testimony that the signs are to follow the believers. They were given to men for a blessing, not for the purpose of accomplishing their conversion, and when Jesus Christ sent His apostles into the world, He said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak

with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." He did not intend that His disciples should go out and show signs to the wicked and adulterous who dared them in order to tempt the Lord our God. I want to bear testimony to you again that we do have these gifts and blessings in the Church, and to say to you that there are many in this audience who can bear sincere and truthful testimony to the fact that they have seen them exercised in their home, for the healing of their sick and for a blessing and comfort and consolation when they were bowed down in sorrow. I want now to leave this discussion with you, praying that God may bless you to see the right, in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

APPENDIX

A synopsis of this debate appeared in the *Deseret News*, which caused some correspondence between Mr. Bunner and Elder Rich. There were also some letters passed between Elder W. S. Langton and Mr. Bunner just before the publication of the debate, and these letters are herewith given as an appendix to the published Discussion.

56 Climas Street, Pittsburg, Pa.
May 10, 1912.

Pres. Ben. E. Rich,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Rich: I have been favored with a copy of *Deserct Evening News* of April 13, containing a synopsis of the Bunner-Rich debate held in Fairmont, W. Va., during the month of March. I also see in said issue that you promise at an early date a full and complete report of said debate in pamphlet form. Nothing would please me better than to see such a pamphlet issued. Should you make a full and complete report in pamphlet form of said debate, let it contain also a picture of yours and mine. I will do all in my power to get the pamphlets before all both Mormons and Anti-Mormons, especially Mormons. But in this synopsis my arguments on the words "Last of all" as you used by both Christ and Paul are *wholly left out.* Also my argument on Revelations showing that John did not see Christ but *only His angel* is also left out. Also you make me say in my first speech Romans 9 when it is Hebrews 9, and my comments on the 9th of Hebrews *are left out.* My arguments showing by your own admission that the Bible is a sufficient guide to guide men to salvation from sin are also left out. If such is to be a full and complete report of the debate, it will be full, but *full of omissions.* Will such a course be fair and honorable? I am anxious to discuss with you or some other representative of your church the entire differences existing between us. This would require a deliberate discussion of 12 to 15 days, then have it printed in

book form by mutual consent. Yes, my argument showing the difference in how the spirit of adoption and the wonder working spirit was received is also left out. I showed that the wonder working spirit was received by laying on of the hands of the apostles, while the spirit of adoption is received by obedience to the Gospel of Christ. You call the church I represent the Christian church and the Christian (Campbellite) church right in the face of the fact that we tell you the name is the Church of Christ. This is neither good manners nor genteel, to say the least of it. I never called you by names that both you and your people repudiate. Again, you apply to me the title *Rev.*, when I kindly asked you not to do so. I told you that if you wished to apply to me the title of either Elder or Evangelist I would make no objections. Like Timothy, I claim to be nothing but an humble minister of Jesus Christ; hence, plain A. A. Bunner, minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, is enough for me, so in the report of the debate be fair and give my arguments in full and I will help you to circulate it as far as I can. After the 17th inst., I will be at Mannington, W. Va., for two or three weeks.

Yours truly,

A. A. BUNNER.

New York City, N. Y.
May 13, 1912.

Mr. A. A. Bunner,
56 Climax St., Pittsburg, Pa.

Dear Mr. Bunner: I am in receipt of your favor of the 10th inst., and in reply to same will say, I have not read the synopsis of the debate published in the *Deseret News*. The same was prepared by one of the Elders, and in as much as it is aimed to be only a short synopsis, I can readily agree with you that many things were left out, both as to what you said and what I also said. If the debate is published in pamphlet form, it will be certainly as near complete as the pamphlet will claim for it. You may rest assured that your argument on the words "Last of all" cannot and will not be overlooked, because I distinctly remem-

ber those words being used so many times that the report in pamphlet form would be of no interest to me without a goodly sprinkle of these words running through your various discourses. You may rest assured that it shall not be a report of "omissions" if I can help it. I am pleased, however, to note that you do not accuse the one preparing the synopsis of quoting you unjustly so far as it went. The Elder preparing the synopsis was ignorant of your objections to the use of the word "Reverend," and with this statement from me I trust you will not look upon it as a wilful attempt to offend you.

I remember distinctly, as noted by you, of admitting that I would use the same argument as used by Peter upon the day of Pentecost in answering anyone's question as to what to do in order to be saved, but you omit the other part of my argument in which I also said that the ordinances would have to be performed by one who was called of God and had the Divine Authority, equal to the authority placed upon the Ancients, who baptized for the remission of sins, and not by those who had taken the honor to themselves.

Not having had anything to do with the publication referred to, I will not share any of the blame for not having your picture in the paper, nor in having my own appear as it did. I do not think my photo added beauty to the publication, nor do I think your own would have done so, therefore if the pamphlet appears I will try and not have it marred with the features of either of us.

Regarding the subject of a twelve-nights debate, which is hinted at in your communication, will simply say that out of the five nights you did not seem to have much more than use for one of them with Biblical argument; the rest, as you will be free to confess, was occupied principally in rehashing Anti-Mormon charges, therefore, I cannot for the life of me see what you could possibly do with twelve nights if you were compelled to confine yourself to arguments found within the lids of King James' Translation of the Holy Scriptures.

I trust you will not think I have a desire to ruffle your feelings in what I have said, but am glad that in all your objections to what has been published in the synopsis there is no room for so much criticism or unfairness as the writer

could find in the lying report of this debate as published by one of your Brethren by the name of Neal.

With kind regards and best wishes,

Yours very truly,

BEN. E. RICH.

New York City, N. Y.
June 7, 1912.

Mr. A. A. Bunner,
Grafton, W. Va.

Dear Mr. Bunner: I am sending you under separate cover and by registered mail a copy of your first speech in hope that you will look it over and make any suggestion you care to concerning it. It may interest you to know that I am preparing the speeches delivered at the debate for publication. I do not claim that they are taken word for word but I have compiled them from the stenographic notes of four stenographers and I have put into them only such matter as all four of these stenographers agreed upon. Even then I have compared these statements with my own notes, as I am ambitious to quote you correctly in everything you may say. Will you do me the kindness to write me concerning anything in this speech in which you think I may have misquoted you? You understand, of course, that speeches delivered off-hand as these speeches were, lack the fine touch that is given to the written sermon and that such a speech could not appear in as good form as a book which one writes and has the opportunity to read and correct and proof-read and correct. I have insisted, however, that they should appear in the pamphlet in the form in which our stenographers took them. When we were in Fairmont we tried to get the court stenographer to take the debate so that there could be absolutely no question about the accuracy of our report. We were willing to pay any price for his services, but we could not get him.

We got the feeling when we were there that you were not altogether in sympathy with the movement, and in order that you may see that I have no disposition in the world to misrepresent you in the slightest particular in this debate I am sending this speech to you. I do not ask your approval

of it for publication but merely as a matter of fairness I offer you the opportunity of saying whether I am mis-quoting you in anything you find in this address. The other speeches are being prepared as fast as my time permits.

Will you return this copy to me at your earliest convenience, with such suggestions as you wish to make?

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

W. S. LANGTON.

Fairmont, W. Va.
June 10, 1912.

Elder W. S. Langton,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Langton: Yours, with what purport to be my first speech in the Bunner-Rich debate, is before me and noted.

I shall attempt no corrections of said speech and shall have nothing at all to do with publishing the debate in pamphlet form. If I would correct the errors, which are numerous, in my speeches, if this one is a fair sample of the rest that shall follow, Ben. E. Rich can go to work and put what he pleases in his speeches. So I refuse to have anything to do with the publishing of the debate on the following grounds: First, it was not understood that the debate would be published, and hence no sufficient arrangements were made for a fair and full report. Second, it is due the public that both sides be fully represented, otherwise the book is of no value with thinking people. Hence, I have invited Mr. Rich to meet me again on the issues with arrangements made for a full report of each speech and for the printing of them jointly, and if Mr. Rich finally refuses to meet me in debate again, I shall brand him as a coward and will reprint his tract of the debate with a supplement setting forth such facts.

The American Anti-Mormon Association will back me to its fullest extent in exposing his partisan methods and sneaking tactics. Under no consideration will I attempt to correct even the spelling of a word in your speeches.

Yours truly,

A. A. BUNNER.

New York City, N. Y.
June 14, 1912.

Mr. A. A. Bunner,
Grafton, W. Va.

Dear Mr. Bunner: Your letter of June 10th came to me promptly, and I was much surprised at its contents. As I said in my former letter, I did not ask your approval of your speeches, but I was merely offering you an opportunity to say whether I had mis-quoted you in any particular. I notice from your letter that you could find no specific instance in this first speech in which you were mis-quoted and so I am sure you would find nothing to object to in the remaining ones.

As to your charge that Ben. E. Rich "can go to work and place whatever he wants in his speeches," let me say that it is untrue and it is entirely unworthy of any Christian gentleman. There will nothing go either into Pres. Rich's speeches or yours which did not appear in the stenographic reports taken at the time.

As to your threat to join hands with the Anti-Mormon Association, I have this to say. I am not sure that adding you to their forces will materially increase their effectiveness, nor am I sure that when they have "backed you to their fullest extent" the united effort will be felt beyond the confines of your ever-narrowing circle.

Your letter relieves me of any obligations to send your other speeches to you, and so far as I am concerned, our correspondence is closed.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours truly,
W. S. LANGTON.

P9-DVW-719